DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 082 786	LI 004 507

TITLE	Minutes of the Meeting (77th, January 17, 1971, Los Angeles, California).
INSTITUTION	Association of Research Libraries, Washington, D.C.ry
PUB DATE	17 Jan 71
NOTE	156p.; (0 references)
AVAILABLE FROM	The Association of Research Libraries, 1527 New Hampshire Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 ($5.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	Conference Reports; *Financial Problems; Library Associations; Meetings; *Microforms; National Programs; *Research Libraries; *Serials; *University Libraries
IDENTIFIERS	*Association of Research Libraries

ABSTRACT

Three topics of prime interest to research libraries are discussed during the program portion of these minutes: microforms, national serials data program, and the financial problems of research libraries. The presentations regarding microforms are the "The ARL Microform Project: A View from Within" and "Controlling the Minutia." In the second group are: "The National Serials Pilot Project," "The National Serials System: Concept and Commitment," and "Research Library Expectations of a National Serials Data Program." Financial problems are discussed in "Budget Constraints at Syracuse," "The Financial Situation of the Ohio State University Libraries in 1970-71 and Beyond," "Problems of Austerity at JUL," "Adversity and Opportunity at Yale," "The Poverty Level at Berkeley," and a report on the document entitled "New Depression in Higher Education." There is also a brief report on the "ARL Preservation Project." Reports of various committees of the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) are included as appendices. (Minutes of other ARL meetings are ED 067115 and LI 004 505, 506, and 004 508 through 004 512.) (SJ)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 082786

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Minutes of the Seventy-Seventh Meeting

January 17, 1971
Los Angeles, California

LI 004 507

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

Association of Research Libraries.
Minutes of the meeting. 1st–
Dec. 1932–
[Princeton, N. J., etc.]

v. 28 cm.

Meetings are numbered irregularly: 9th–10th, 12th called respectively: 10th–11th, 13th.
INDEXES:
Subject index.

1st–42d, Dec. 1932–Jan. 1954. 1 v.

Z673.A84 59–30046

Library of Congress [3]

These Minutes are printed on a stable and enduring paper.

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

OFFICERS AND BOARD OF DIRECTORS

1971

Thomas R. Buckman, Northwestern University - President
John P. McDonald, University of Connecticut - Vice President
Warren J. Haas, Columbia University - Past President

Ben C. Bowman, University of Rochester (Jan. 1974)
William S. Budington, John Crerar (Jan. 1973)
Herman H. Fussler, University of Chicago (Jan. 1973)
David Kaser, Cornell University (Jan. 1972)
Arthur M. McAnally, University of Oklahoma (Jan. 1974)
Robert Vosper, University of California, L. A. (Jan. 1972)
David C. Weber, Stanford University (Jan. 1974)

STAFF

Stephen A. McCarthy..........Executive Director
Louis E. Martin.............Associate Executive Director

E. Alex Baer................Director, Slavic Bibliographic and Documentation Center
Donald W. Johnson...........Director, National Serials Pilot Project
Duane E. Webster............Director, Office of University Library Management Studies
P. K. Yu....................Director, Center for Chinese Research Materials

The office of the Association of Research Libraries is located at 1527 New Hampshire Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C. 20036. Telephone (202) 232-2466.

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

1971 Committees

Availability of Resources Committee

Chairman: Richard Chapin
- Warren Boes
- David Heron
- Ralph Hopp
- Arthur McAnally

Committee on Copying Manuscripts and Unpublished Materials

Chairman: James Henderson
- Roy Basler
- William Bond
- William Cagle
- Verner Clapp
- Oliver W. Holmes

Committee on Library Security

Chairman: Ben Bowman
- Kenneth Allen
- Myles Slatin

Copyright Committee

Chairman: Verner Clapp

Federal Relations Committee

Chairman: Robert Vosper
- Stuart Forth
- W. Carl Jackson
- Benjamin Powell
- Rutherford Rogers
- James Skipper
- Chairman of Foreign Acquisitions Committee

Foreign Acquisitions Committee

Chairman: Philip McNiff
Vice Chairman: Marion Milczewski
- Edmond L. Applebaum
- Lloyd Griffin
- Gordon Williams

Chairman of Area Subcommittees:
- Louis Jacob (South Asia)
- Robert K. Johnson (Latin America)
- David Kaser (Southeast Asia)
- Marion Milczewski (Eastern Europe)
- Hans Panofsky (Africa)
- David Partington (Middle East)
- Howard Sullivan (Western Europe)
- Warren Tsuneishi (Far East)
- Chairman of Foreign Newspaper Microfilm Committee
- Chairman of Shared Cataloging Committee

Foreign Newspaper Microfilm Committee

Chairman: John Lorenz
- Gordon Bechanan
- Louis Kaplan
- Basil Stuart-Stubbs
- Gordon Williams

Membership Committee

Chairman: William Locke
- John Gribbin
- Arthur Hamlin

Microfilming Dissertations Committee

Chairman: Gustave Harrer
- Thomas Buckman
- Stuart Forth
- J. Boyd Page
- David Weber

Nominating Committee

Chairman: John McDonald

Non-GPO Publication Committee

Chairman: Jerrold Orne
Clifton Brock
William Budington
Edward Di Roma
Benjamin Powell

Periodicals Resources Center Study Committee

Chairman: Joseph Jeffs
John Berthel
D. F. Finn

Preservation Committee

Chairman: Warren Haas
Secretary: Donald Anthony
Robert Blackburn
Douglas Bryant
Verner Clapp
Herman Fussler
James Henderson
L. Quincy Mumford
Rutherford Rogers
Gordon Williams

Shared Cataloging Committee

Chairman: David Kaser
Lewis Branscomb
Ralph Ellsworth
Edmon Low
John McDonald
James Skipper

Standards Committee

Chairman: Jerrold Orne
Eugene Kennedy
LeRoy Ortopan
Howard Rovelstad
John Sherrod

Training for Research Librarianship Committee

Chairman: David Kaser
Gordon Bechanan
Robert Downs
Warren Haas
Warren Kuhn
John McDonald
James Skipper
Raynard Swank

1971 Project Advisory Committees

Center for Chinese Research Materials

Chairman: Philip McNiff
John Israel
Frederick W. Mote
James Townsend
Warren Tsuneishi
Eugene Wu

Interlibrary Loan Study Committee

Chairman: Arthur McAnally
Gordon Bechanan
David Heron
Sarah Thompson
Gordon Williams

Microform Project

Task I: Bibliographic Control
Principal Investigator: Felix Reichmann
Assistant Principal Investigator: Josephine Tharpe
Samuel Boone
Helen Brown
Lyman Butterfield
Richard DeGennaro
Allen Veaner

Task II: National Microform Agency
Principal Investigator: Edward Miller
Thomas C. Bagg
John H. Berthel
Forrest Carhart, Jr.
Donald C. Holmes
Charles G. LaHood, Jr.
Carl Nelson

National Serials Pilot Project

Chairman: William Budington
Roy Kidman
John McGowan
Jerrold Orne

Slavic Bibliographic and Documentation Center

Chairman: Marion Milczewski
William Edgerton
Richard Pipes
Joseph Placek
Sergius Yakobson

1971 Joint Committees

ACRL-ARL Committee on University Library Standards

Chairman: Robert Downs
Clifton Brock
Gustave Harrer
Jay Lucker
Ellsworth Mason
John McDonald
Norman E. Tanis

ARL-ACE Committee on University Library Management

Chairman: Warren Haas
Willard Boyd, President
University of Iowa
Douglas Bryant
Allan Cartter, Chancellor
New York University
Herman Fussler
Howard Johnson, President
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Richard Lyman, President
Stanford University
John McDonald
Robert Vosper

* * * * *

Councilor to the American Library Association	Stephen McCarthy
Representative on Advisory Committee to National Translation Center (Crerar)	Joseph Shipman
Representative on Joint Statistics Coordinating Committee	Harold Gordon
Representative on Joint Committee on Union List of Serials	William Budington
Representatives on COSATI Task Group on Libraries	Stephen McCarthy John Berthel Joseph Jeffs
Representatives on Library of Congress Liaison Committee for Librarians:	ARL President ARL Vice President ARL Executive Director
Representative to United States Book Exchange	Porter Kellam
Representative on ANSI Committee Z-39	Jerrold Orne
Representative on ANSI Committee Z-85	LeRoy Ortopan

The following member institutions were represented at the 77th meeting:

University of Alabama Library
Joseph A. Jackson

University of Alberta Library
Bruce Peel

University of Arizona Library
Robert K. Johnson

Boston Public Library
Philip J. McNiff

University of British Columbia Library
Basil Stuart-Stubbs

University of California Library
(Berkeley) James E. Skipper

University of California Library
(Davis) J. R. Blanchard

Case Western Reserve University Libraries
James V. Jones

Center for Research Libraries
Gordon R. Williams

University of Chicago Library
Herman H. Fussler

University of Cincinnati Libraries
Bruce Kauffman

University of Colorado Library
Leo Cabell

Columbia University Libraries
Warren J. Haas

University of Connecticut Library
John P. McDonald

Cornell University Libraries
David Kaser

Duke University Libraries
Benjamin E. Powell

University of Florida Libraries
Gustave A. Harrer

Florida State University Library
N. Orwin Rush

Georgetown University Library
Joseph E. Jeffs

University of Georgia Libraries
W. P. Kellam

Harvard University Library
Douglas W. Bryant

University of Illinois Library
Robert B. Downs

Indiana University Libraries
Cecil Byrd

University of Iowa Libraries
Leslie W. Dunlap

Iowa State University Library
Warren Kuhn

John Crerar Library
William S. Budington

Johns Hopkins University Library
John H. Berthel

Joint University Libraries
Frank P. Grisham

University of Kansas Library
David W. Heron

University of Kentucky Libraries
Stuart Forth

Library of Congress
Elizabeth E. Hamer
John Lorenz

Linda Hall Library
Joseph C. Shipman

Louisiana State University Library
T. N. McMullan

McGill University Library
Keith Crouch

University of Maryland Library
Howard Rovelstad

Massachusetts Institute of Technology Libraries
William N. Locke

University of Michigan Library
Joseph Treyz

Michigan State University Library
Richard Chapin

University of Minnesota Libraries
Ralph Hopp

University of Missouri Library
C. Edward Carroll

National Library of Medicine
Joseph Leiter

University of Nebraska Libraries
Frank A. Lundy

New York Public Library
James Henderson

New York State Library
John A. Humphry

New York University Libraries
Charles F. Gosnell

University of North Carolina Libraries
Jerrold Orne

Northwestern University Libraries
Thomas R. Buckman

University of Notre Dame Libraries
Robert Ennen

Ohio State University Libraries
Lewis C. Branscomb

University of Oklahoma Library
Arthur M. McAnally

Oklahoma State University Library
Roscoe Rouse

University of Oregon Library
Carl W. Hintz

University of Pennsylvania Libraries
Richard DeGennaro

Pennsylvania State University Library
W. Carl Jackson

University of Pittsburgh Library
Glenora Edwards Rossell

Princeton University Library
William S. Dix

Purdue University Library
Keith Dowden

University of Rochester Libraries
Ben Bowman

Rutgers University Library
Roy L. Kidman

St. Louis University Library
Eugene P. Kennedy

University of Southern California Library
Hazel Rea

Southern Illinois University Library
Ralph E. McCoy

Stanford University Libraries
David C. Weber

State University of New York at Buffalo Libraries
Myles Slatin

Syracuse University Library
Warren N. Boes

Temple University Library
Arthur Hamlin

University of Tennessee Libraries
Richard Boss

University of Texas Libraries
Heartsill Young

Texas A&M University Library
John B. Smith

University of Toronto Libraries
Jack Cain

Tulane University Library
John H. Gribbin

University of Utah Library
Ralph D. Thomson

University of Virginia Libraries
Miss Roy Land

University of Washington Library
Marion A. Milczewski

Washington State University Library
G. Donald Smith

Washington University Libraries
Andrew J. Eaton

Wayne State University Library
Mark M. Gormley

University of Wisconsin Libraries
Louis Kaplan

Yale University Libraries
Rutherford D. Rogers

ARL Staff:

Stephen A. McCarthy	Executive Director
Louis E. Martin	Associate Executive Director
Donald W. Johnson	Director, National Serials Pilot Project
Duane E. Webster	Director, Office of University Library Management Studies

Program Participants:

Louis E. Martin	Project Director, Microform Project
Felix Reichmann	Principal Investigator, Task I, Microform Project
Richard DeGennaro	Advisory Committee, Task I, Microform Project
Donald W. Johnson	Director, National Serials Pilot Project
Samuel Lazerow	Chairman, National Libraries' Task Force on Automation
William S. Budington	Chairman, Advisory Committee, National Serials Pilot Project
Douglas W. Bryant	Harvard University Library
Lewis C. Branscomb	Ohio State University Libraries
Warren N. Boes	Syracuse University Library
Frank P. Grisham	Joint University Libraries
James E. Skipper	University of California Library, Berkeley

Guests:

Kenneth Allen	University of Washington Library
Verner W. Clapp	Council on Library Resources
Henry Dubester	National Science Foundation
Burton E. Lamkin	U.S. Office of Education
Lawrence G. Livingston	Council on Library Resources
Keyes D. Metcalf	
Ronald Miller	New England Library and Information Network
Foster Mohrhardt	Council on Library Resources
Patricia Smith	U.S. Office of Education
Carl M. Spaulding	Council on Library Resources
Frank A. Stevens	U.S. Office of Education

The following member institutions were not represented at the 77th meeting:

Boston University Library

Brown University Library

University of California Library, Los Angeles

Dartmouth College Libraries

University of Massachusetts Libraries

National Agricultural Library

CONTENTS

Page

ARL Officers, Board and Staff.................................... ii
ARL Committees... iii
Attendance--77th Meeting... vii

Introduction... 1
"The ARL Microform Project: A View From Within" -- Louis Martin...... 2
"Controlling the Minutia" -- Felix Reichmann......................... 6
Discussion... 9
"The National Serials Pilot Project" -- Donald Johnson............... 11
"The National Serials System: Concept and Commitment" Samuel Lazerow................ 17
"Research Library Expectations of a National Serials Data Program" -- William Budington.................. 21
Discussion... 25
ARL Preservation Project -- Warren J. Haas........................... 27
"Budget Constraints at Syracuse" -- Warren Boes...................... 29
"The Financial Situation of the Ohio State University Libraries in 1970-71 and Beyond" -- Lewis Branscomb....... 31
"Problems of Austerity at JUL" -- Frank Grisham...................... 34
"Adversity and Opportunity at Yale" -- Rutherford Rogers............. 37
"The Poverty Level at Berkeley" -- James Skipper..................... 38
New Depression in Higher Education -- James Skipper.................. 40
Discussion... 42
Election of New Board Members.................................... 46
Election of New Members to the Association....................... 46
Report of the Membership Committee................................ 48
Report of the Library of Congress................................ 52
Report of the Committee on Research Libraries of the ACLS........... 54
Report of the Office of University Library Management Studies........ 55
Executive Director's Report...................................... 55
Discussion on Membership Committee and Admission of New Members...... 57
President's Report... 59

Appendices

A. Proposed Amendment to Bylaws.................................. 60
B. Bylaws of the Association of Research Libraries.................. 61
C. Report of the Center for Chinese Research Materials.............. 70
D. Report of the National Serials Pilot Project..................... 72
E. Report of the Office of University Library Management Studies.... 75
F. Report of the Slavic Bibliographic and Documentation Center...... 77
G. Report of the ARL Ad Hoc Committee on Specifications for a Study of Automation in Research Libraries........ 79
H. Report of the Federal Relations Committee........................ 84
I. Report of the Foreign Newspaper Microfilm Committee.............. 85
J. Report of the Interlibrary Loan Study Committee.................. 86
K. Report of the ARL/ACE Committee on University Library Management............ 87
L. Report of the ARL/ACRL Joint Committee on University Library Standards............. 89

C O N T E N T S

Page

M. Report of the ARL Representative to the American National Standards Institute Standards Committee Z39.......... 90
N. Report of the Representative to the Joint Committee on the Union List of Serials............ 93
O. Report of the Representative to the U. S. Book Exchange.......... 94
P. Report of the Library of Congress.............................. 96
Q. Report of the National Agricultural Library..................... 127
R. Report of the National Library of Medicine...................... 130
S. Auditor's Report... 134
T. ARL Membership... 141

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

Minutes of the 77th Meeting

Los Angeles, California

January 17, 1971

-

Warren J. Haas, presiding

-

The Seventy-seventh Meeting of the Association of Research Libraries was held in the Music Room of the Biltmore Hotel, Los Angeles, California, on January 17, 1971.

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m. by President Warren J. Haas.

Mr. Haas opened the meeting by introducing the new and alternate representatives of member institutions and the guests of the Association who were in attendance. He explained that the program portion of the meeting would deal with three topics: 1) The Microform Project, 2) The National Serials Pilot Project, and 3) The Problem of Austerity Budgets in University Libraries.

Mr. Haas introduced Louis Martin, associate executive director of the Association, who commented on the objectives and activities of the Microform Project.

The ARL Microform Project: A View From Within

Mr. Martin: I assume that when Messrs. Haas and McCarthy asked me--the word, "asked," is perhaps not entirely appropriate--to give a brief and general report to the membership on the Microform Project, preparatory to Dr. Reichmann's remarks, they knew that I could lay no claim to expertise in microform technology. In fact, technology and all its pomps and works leave me, if not shaken, more than a little confused. After all, a person who finds loading his Polaroid camera a dreadful task will certainly resist becoming involved with reduction ratios and vesicular heat developing film.

Why then am I presenting these remarks? My credentials consist almost solely in having been present at and since the creation of this effort. In fact, the Microform Project confronted me on my first visit to the ARL office shortly after I arrived in Washington in June of 1968. I was not yet officially on the ARL payroll, but had dropped by the Massachusetts Avenue address to do a bit of poking around. Mrs. Kousis, then as now our trusted clerk of the works, handed me a telegram from the Office of Education, which stated that the OE was awarding the Association a small grant for a microform study. It went on to say that notification of acceptance of the contract had to be received within twenty-four hours, since the contract had to be awarded by the end of the fiscal year and it was already June 29. In the absence of Stephen McCarthy, who was attending the ARL meeting in Kansas City, I notified the Office of Education that we would be delighted to accept this responsibility. I did this, of course, without having the foggiest notion of what we were about, and it has been said by a few friendly critics that that circumstance has characterized my continued involvement in the project. On the other hand, I have worked closely with the principal investigators; have served as the amanuensis for most of the committee meetings; have developed proposals; prepared budgets; written progress reports; and have seen the first two interim reports through to completion. Finally, there is the fact that I am officially listed as the project director for 1971.

The purpose of this rather meandering introduction is to give notice that my remarks on the Microform Project stem from a highly personal and very unexpert perspective. Prior to coming to the ARL office, my knowledge of microforms consisted of knowing that their use at the University of Rochester Libraries was far from what it should have been, because of inadequate physical accommodations--subsequently corrected, at least to some degree--and a lack of well trained staff to serve the readers. I was to find out that our situation at Rochester was not atypical.

This report will not review all of the activities of the project which is now in its third year. Rather, I should like to comment on three aspects of it: 1) The occasion for our involvement in microform studies; 2) the accomplishments of the project to date, both for the ARL office and the user community; and 3) what we hope to accomplish during this calendar year.

The occasion for, if not the cause of, the beginning of the project was the interest of the Office of Education in bringing about a wider and more effective use of microforms, especially in the area of instruction. This interest on the part of the OE has resulted in its support of a number of investigations bearing on the utilization of microforms. The Association decided to become part of this research effort because we felt we could make a contribution in this area which is vital to the services rendered by research libraries.

With regard to what has been accomplished, let us first look at the impact of this project on the ARL office. It should be noted in passing that with a view to the history of the Association the microform investigation was the second major undertaking of the Association in the year 1 A.M., that is, After McCarthy. The first, of course, was the establishment of the Center for Chinese Research Materials.

In preparing for the study and in conducting it, the executive director, to a lesser degree, and the associate executive director, to a far greater degree, have learned a good deal. Several minor benefits should be noted first. For example, we quickly became adept at choosing misleading titles for proposals. The proposal for the first phase of the project was entitled, "Determination of User Needs and Future Requirements for a Systems Approach to Microform Technology." As it turned out, only the first phrase, "Determination of User Needs," proved to be accurate. We divined during the very first meeting of the advisory committee that we were not about to lay out the requirements for a total systems approach to microform technology. Again, the word, "technology," cannot be said to describe adequately our primary interest. Although the principal investigators and their advisory committees have addressed some technological problems, a quick reading of the two interim reports clearly shows that technology is only one of the topics treated.

Another minor benefit is that we have developed the ability to overwork certain key words, an ability which appears endemic to writers of proposals and reports. Our prime example is that truly remarkable word, "determination." It is the first word in the title of our first proposal and, just as a good quarterback sticks to what is working--Mr. Lamonica excepted--we have relied on it ever since. The first continuation proposal calls for the determination of the environmental conditions required in a library for the effective utilization of microforms and the determination of an effective system of bibliographic control of microform publications. The second continuation proposal requested an extension of Dr. Reichmann's work on the bibliographic control problem and in addition proposed--you guessed it--the determination of the functional and administrative characteristics of a national microform agency. A list of word crutches could be developed ad nauseam. You will be spared that experience.

There have been, however, some positive in-house results from our efforts. We now feel somewhat at home with the methods and procedures involved in submitting proposals to the Office of Education and other funding agencies; in preparing budgets, which have at least a distant relationship to reality; in mastering the form, if not the content, of progress and interim reports; in keeping the lid on committee meetings, which at times can get pretty hairy; and in identifying--there's another key word--the goodly number of people within the federal establishment who are more than willing to lead the uninitiated through the labyrinthine ways of government contracts and grants. This experience has been and should continue to be invaluable. But what about the far more important accomplishments which we hope will redound to the benefit of the users of microforms?

From my point of view, the first interim report, dated July 19, 1969, is an important document. If it were judged by bulk alone, it would appear to be insignificant, since it runs only to thirty-five pages. Within those pages, however, Donald Holmes, principal investigator, has clearly and concisely documented the most important problems which prevent microforms from being used as effectively as they might, should and must be. It is true that others have been working in this area and have made significant contributions. The work of William Hawken, David Weber and Allen Veaner are examples. The accomplishments of Mr. Holmes rest in his procedures and in the content of his report. First, during the entire course of his investigation, he was aided by an extremely well qualified advisory committee, which included in its membership some of the finest microform experts in the country. Further, this group was a real working committee. They met often to review the progress of the study and took time to submit in writing their thoughts on the more important aspects of it. Secondly, Mr. Holmes roamed over the entire country talking with librarians, students, faculty members, and representatives of commercial organizations and government agencies. His purpose was to test in the field the validity of the assumptions on which the study was based. These assumptions were: 1) that microforms are important carriers of information in libraries; and 2) that the use of microforms has not reached its potential because of a number of serious problems involved in their acquisition, cataloging, storage and use.

His interviews confirmed and his report explains what members of this audience know all too well. Libraries are acquiring microforms at what appears to be an ever increasing rate. The annual academic library statistics, compiled by the ARL, bear out this contention. For the year, 1968-69, seventy-two university library members of the Association reported total holdings of microform units of just under 28 million; in 1969-70, the holdings of seventy-four reporting libraries were well over 34 million units. There is no reason to believe that the rate of microform publication will decrease--although acquisitions might if present budget restraints continue. There is no doubt that the newer and smaller institutions of higher education will place increasing reliance upon microforms to develop their collections quickly.

Mr. Holmes' investigation also confirmed, however, the rather appalling situation faced by many libraries and their users after the decision to purchase a microform publication has been made and the microforms have been received. To begin with, libraries often are in a position of buying a pig in a poke. As you ladies and gentlemen are well aware, no library has sufficient staff to check each unit of microform received both for technical quality and bibliographic accuracy. Only the Lord knows what is sitting on those shelves in the microform reading room or is stored in those microform storage cabinets. Generally, we learn of inaccurate targets, misplaced pages, illegible copy and splices made with cellophane tape only when a student or faculty member has occasion to use a particular microform. Admittedly, the same situation obtains with regard to hard copy, but if the experience of several reputable testing laboratories can serve as a guide, the incidence of poor quality microforms is much higher than that of poor quality hard copy.

Our lack of confidence in what we have purchased is only the first in a long series of difficulties involved in proper utilization of microforms. Libraries have had to purchase too many different kinds of microforms. Each type demands its own particular hardware, the proper use of which often confuses the users. Too often, the result is damaged microforms and equipment.

This latter situation, as Mr. Holmes points out, presupposes that the user actually can find what he wants on microform. Often this is not the case. Mr. Holmes' survey reenforced the experience of many of us who have seen catalogers employ every stratagem to avoid cataloging microforms, a reaction which is at least partially understandable in view of the backlogs of hard copy material. To say that microforms are not given equal priority with books in technical processes is to deal in understatement. As a consequence, microform publications often are not completely represented in the catalog. The user is then forced to rely upon publishers' printed guides when available or guides to an individual library's microform collection. The latter are few in number, as Dr. Reichmann has found, because of the lack of sufficient staff to prepare them.

In addition, it is a rarity to find a microform reading area which provides a truly efficient physical environment for the use of microforms. David Weber took note of this fact some time ago in an excellent short article which appeared in the UNESCO Bulletin for Libraries, in which he developed recommendations for an effective microform reading room. It is surprising, however, that some new and otherwise excellent libraries have rather badly short-changed the microform reading area.

This list of miseries could go on and on, but there is no need for a complete catalog of complaints for this particular audience. What should be emphasized with regard to Mr. Holmes' document is that it clearly lays out the problems which must be overcome if microphobia, on the part of users and librarians, is to disappear and, just as importantly, it recommends a number of steps which could be taken to obviate the more serious obstacles.

Mr. Holmes' comprehensive evaluation of the microform situation resulted in the continuation of the project during the year 1969-70. The twin goals of that phase of the project were to develop guidelines for good physical facilities for microform reading areas, and to investigate the possibility of developing an effective system of bibliographic control. The second interim report contains Mr. Holmes' recommendations with regard both to the necessary physical facilities and the proper training of staff who have responsibility for microform collections. Dr. Reichmann's study of the bibliographic control problem continues and you will hear about that very shortly.

The most important undertaking stemming directly from Mr. Holmes' initial study perhaps is that which is just now started, the study of the essential components of a national microform agency.

Officially, this investigation began January 1, with Mr. Edward Miller, formerly of the National Library of Medicine, as its principal investigator. Shortly after the beginning of the microform project, Mr. Holmes and his committee and, subsequently, Dr. Reichmann and his committee reached the conclusion that all efforts to improve microform publication and use depended upon development of a centralized agency which could provide a kind of "national intelligence" to the problems. As we see it at this point, this agency could perform a number of important functions for libraries and their users. It could have a testing capability for both microforms and related products; it could provide consulting services for libraries developing microform collections and reading facilities; it could act as an effective liaison between the library community and microform publishers; it could serve as a clearinghouse of information on all aspects of microform technology and administration; and, perhaps most importantly, it could update and develop acceptable specifications for microform products.

We hope that Mr. Miller's efforts and those of his committee will result in a specific and practical blueprint for such an agency. Every important aspect will be studied, including its administration, location, funding and activities. If this effort is successful, it will be the capstone of the entire project and would insure the implementation of the recommendations made by Mr. Holmes in his initial study and those which Dr. Reichmann will provide in his final report this summer.

Once again, the ARL office will be asking selected members of the Association to assist us during the next six months. Mr. Miller will be consulting with both librarians and publishers in order to find out whether such a national microform agency is a viable concept. With your help, the world of miniaturization will not continue to be "out of sight."

* * * * *

Mr. Haas: We shall now hear from Felix Reichmann who will ask for assistance from this group in solving the bibliographic control problems involved in the organization of microforms.

Controlling the Minutiae

Mr. Reichmann: Ladies and gentlemen, I am not here to tell you anything which you do not already know. I am here to ask your assistance with this problem of effective bibliographic control of microform publications. My colleague, Miss Tharpe, and I, along with our advisory committee, have been working on this subject for over sixteen months. Our literature search, correspondence and discussions have led to a number of tentative conclusions, but at this point the word, "tentative," must be emphasized. During the next several months, we shall be testing these conclusions against the hard realities of the working world of research libraries. If they survive close scrutiny, they will appear in our final report.

We all are aware of the recent dramatic growth of the micrographic industry and of the impact of that growth on the collections of research libraries. Forecasts of the future growth of micrographics differ only in their estimates of the degree of acceleration. One analysis, to be published in the summer of 1971, states that between 1960 and 1970, the dollar volume of the micropublishing market increased 1,000 percent. It goes on to say that the market may reach one-half billion dollars over the next ten years. (By the way, interested librarians will be able to purchase this analysis for the paltry sum of $2,000.) Another publication, which costs only $295, predicts that the industry will more than quadruple in the next decade. A knowledgeable consultant to various micropublishing enterprises predicts an increase of $600,000 in dollar volume over the next five or six years, while another specialist takes a more conservative view and opines that the growth will be a mere $300,000. If any of these predictions are correct, libraries will be faced, budgets permitting, with acquiring an ever increasing store of microforms. Unfortunately, we are no better prepared to handle this avalanche of the future than we were prepared to handle the rock slide of the past.

Part of our problem admittedly is psychological. The acceptance by mankind of new forms of communication has always been accompanied by predictions of disaster. When parchment codices replaced papyri scrolls, the great physician, Galen, predicted that readers would go blind because the reading of parchment would be detrimental to the human eye. When printed books replaced hand-produced books twelve hundred years later, a well known bibliographer was convinced that they would last no longer than one hundred years and that only parchment codices would survive. Perhaps the lesson to be learned is that we shall overcome the trauma produced among some readers and librarians by the increased use of microforms. The prospect of eventual health, however, does little to alleviate the present suffering of our departments of technical services.

It is safe to say that the proper cataloging of microforms in most libraries is a matter of second or even third priority. This means that in many libraries this cataloging is not done at all. Having worked all my life in the area of technical services, I understand the pressures under which catalogers work and why, as a result, the printed book is given primary attention. After all, microforms can be shunted aside rather easily and can even be hidden away in drawers. (Drawers may be the most dangerous invention of humanity.) This removes the problem from view, but doesn't solve it. It only compounds it.

One of the problems involved in cataloging microforms may stem from the fact that we are accustomed to accepting some kind of relation between the price of a book and the cataloging attention it gets. If a library pays several hundred dollars for a rare sixteenth century book, it doesn't mind paying ten dollars or so to catalog it fully. Even if the library pays only thirty dollars for a reprint edition, it still accepts the cataloging costs. However, if a microform edition is purchased for no more than five dollars, the situation changes. Who can defend a processing cost of ten dollars for a microform that costs half that or even one-tenth of the cataloging cost? Then there is the problem of quantity. The purchase of sixteenth century books is a rare occurence, but microforms are acquired by the hundreds and even the thousands at one fell swoop.

We are, therefore, somewhat bewildered as to the best course to follow in developing bibliographic control of microforms. Many libraries are asking for guidance on this matter. That, of course, is the reason for my remarks today. I wish to lay the problem before you and to elicit your responses to it, either today or in future correspondence.

There is general agreement that microforms should receive full descriptive cataloging, following basic rules established for the cataloging of the original. I see no reason to deviate from this practice. With regard to classification, however, there is a wide divergence of opinion. Some believe that complete classification is absolutely necessary; on the other hand, many librarians feel that a simple sequential numbering device is all that is needed. Personally, I feel that close subject classification for microforms is neither needed nor warranted. One of the reasons for close classification is browsing and one does not browse among microforms. On the other hand, mere sequential numbering may be too simple. Cornell follows this practice--and I am to a large extent responsible for that procedure--but I now think it may have been a mistake. During the course of this study, I have tentatively decided that broad classification of microforms, using either the first letter of the LC classification or the first digits of Dewey, may be helpful. These would be followed by a sequential number. This would allow the transfer, if necessary, of large blocks of microforms to various parts of the library system. This simple subject classification would not be too expensive and it may very well be worth the price. This is one of the questions on which I need your advice.

The major problem in bibliographic control of microforms centers on the control of large microform series, involving hundreds and even thousands of titles. Traditional cataloging practice calls for the preparation of full analytics for these sets. Now all of us are aware of the difficulties presented to technical services departments by the need to analyze large series. Often there is not enough staff to accomplish the task and libraries will content themselves with a series entry only. When staff and time are available, full analytics exacerbate the problem of file size, assuming there are enough filers to put the cards into the catalog. In spite of my predilection for full cataloging for every title owned by a library, I must admit this practice cannot continue. Keep in mind that several micropublishing projects already underway involve thousands of titles each. Even when catalog cards are supplied for each title by the publisher, there often is not the staff to file these cards and, even if there were, the available catalog space may not accommodate them. This situation is bound to get worse, in view of the growth of the micrographic industry. You will note, of course, that I am not even touching upon the cataloging problems caused by individual libraries adapting catalog cards in order to be internally consistent. Further, we all know that the cataloging copy supplied by some microform publishers is often incomplete and inaccurate.

How then do we cope with these problems in a manner which will allow effective bibliographic control at a price we can afford to pay? Should we create indexes to microform sets similar to the periodical indexes? This would be very expensive even if feasible. Would it be possible to use automatic data processing procedures to control this flood of material? Again, we have no mechanism to accomplish this and the question of cost is again very relevant, especially if we were to think of a central store of bibliographic data to which libraries would have on-line access through terminals. This central store of data poses a problem. Would it be located at the Library of Congress, perhaps as part of the National Register of Microform Masters? Would it be located within the national microform agency referred to by Mr. Martin? Or should it be a separate operation which would form the nucleus of a national lending library?

As you can see, I have nothing but questions at this point. What is clear to me is that traditional cataloging procedures will not accomplish the kind of bibliographic control we need of the ever increasing number of microform publications. A new approach is needed. My colleagues and I are counting on you to give us the benefit of your advice so that we may suggest viable solutions to this most important problem.

Thank you very much.

Discussion: Mr. Hamlin (Temple): I think all of us would be interested in hearing a little more about the proposed national microform agency, especially as it might relate to the problem of bibliographic control.

Mr. Martin: We are in a situation where we cannot answer that question with any precision and will not be able to until Dr. Reichmann's recommendations for a system of bibliographic control at the local, national and international levels are submitted.

We also don't know as yet the exact configuration of a national microform agency. We are trying to determine it through Mr. Miller's investigation. Theoretically, it could provide the structure for the implementation of a system of bibliographic control. At this point, however, we can not say for certain. The best method of bibliographic control might not be a priority item for a national microform agency. Frankly, I would be very disappointed if this turned out to be the case, because I think bibliographic control may be one of the more important tasks with which the agency could be involved. The agency could provide a kind of national intelligence to the problems that Dr. Reichmann has pointed out.

Mr. DeGennaro (Pennsylvania): I should like to ask Dr. Reichmann whether or not the microform publishers might resist the idea of a national lending library. If one were to be developed, it would seem to me that only a limited number of these microform sets would be necessary. This would limit the market tremendously and might even dry up the production of these publications.

Mr. Reichmann: That danger may very well exist. A solution, however, must be found and I despair of finding it among the publishers. For years we tried to do something about the control of reprints, but the publishers simply would not cooperate. On the other hand, I am not certain that a national lending library would drastically reduce the market. There always will be pressure, at least from faculty and students, to have as many titles as possible on campus. The relatively low cost of microforms will perhaps increase this pressure. The faculty, students, administrators and donors to the libraries do not see the in-house problems which result from the purchase of these large sets.

Perhaps I should not have emphasized the lending library. Our real concern is for a central agency that would solve the bibliographic control problem. As I said, my first thought was the Library of Congress because of its vast holdings and the bibliographic apparatus at its command. There certainly is the question, however, of overloading the Library of Congress.

Mr. Boss (Tennessee): I wonder if we may not be overlooking a more fundamental problem than that of microforms, alone. Let us assume for a moment that the price of hard copies were to be reduced to $1 each and you could, in fact, buy them by the carload. Wouldn't this overload the catalog departments just as severely as the number of microform titles which are now being made available? It seems to me that your study may be overemphasizing the physical form in which we receive information. A more fundamental problem is that we need to distinguish between those materials that are frequently used and those which have infrequent use. If this is the case, it might be appropriate to fully catalog and classify some microforms and not to fully catalog and classify some hard copies. A national lending library would then have some hard copies and some microforms, depending upon frequency of use.

Mr. Reichmann: Your point is well taken. However, the determination of frequency of use is a difficult one and, personally, I don't think it is a basis for attacking this problem. For example, a title infrequently used in one library may be heavily used in another.

Further, the cataloging of microforms does present problems more severe than the cataloging of hard copies. It involves special handling and the use of hardware, which often is not very effective.

Mr. Williams (Center for Research Libraries): I just wish to point out, with respect to the possible reaction of microform publishers to a national lending library, that the libraries should chart their own course. We must keep in mind the fact that almost the sole market for micropublications of the type we are discussing is libraries. Other materials may be sold widely to individuals. This is not the case with microforms, at least not at present. What we're really discussing is the manner in which libraries are going to spend their own money. It is up to them to decide whether or not they will spend $10,000 to supply their needs or ten times that amount simply because the microform publisher wishes to put $90,000 in his pocket. That's exactly where it is going today. The library community, working cooperatively, should determine its needs and means of satisfying them and should not concern itself with the wishes of the publishers.

Mr. Clapp (Council on Library Resources): Dr. Reichmann, I am sure you are aware of the proposal to renew cataloging-in-source, now called cataloging-in-publication (CIP). Have you considered it as contributing to a possible solution of the problems facing you? It seems to me that if we could implement a CIP program, which would mean that every publication--original, reprint or microform--carried with it full bibliographic information, in a form usable by libraries and others, we would have the means of solving the bibliographic control problem. Any title that did not have a CIP entry should be condemned and treated as an outsider. If it had such an entry, it would be part of the national bibliographic record.

Mr. Reichmann: This would be a partial solution, but the problem of filing an enormous number of cards remains. You know my sympathy for a good card catalog. I think it may be the best solution to our problem, but people in the field say they cannot maintain it.

Mr. Haas: Time will permit only one more question, which will have to go unanswered, but we will at least get it on the record.

Mr. Stuart-Stubbs (British Columbia): Tomorrow the Resources Committee of the RTSD Committee will be meeting to discuss one aspect of this problem. We will consider the compilation and publication of a directory of major microform projects, listing them by title and giving some information on price and publisher. This directory will be based on existing bibliographies, which, of course, do not provide a final solution. There is nothing like that beautiful card catalog, but our efforts may be a partial help.

Mr. Haas: Mr. Reichmann assures me that he will make use of every idea and every opinion that comes his way. We trust he shall receive many from this audience.

* * * * *

Mr. Haas: The second part of our morning program will focus on another fundamental problem that must be solved. Fortunately, there are a number of people working towards a solution. A national serials data program, a topic that has been alive and central for years, will be discussed. Our first speaker will be Donald Johnson, director of the National Serials Pilot Project. Mr. Johnson will explain both the problems encountered by and the accomplishments of the project, which we hope will be the first step toward a national serials data program.

Mr. Johnson will be followed by Samuel Lazerow, chairman of the National Libraries' Task Force on Automation, who will inform us as to what lies ahead for the program when responsibility for it is assumed by the Library of Congress.

William Budington, chairman of the advisory committee to the Pilot Project, will give us his views on the needs and the expectations of the research libraries relative to a national serials data program.

The National Serials Pilot Project

Mr. Johnson: Sixteen months ago today, I became director of the National Serials Pilot Project. Since then, I would like to believe, much has been accomplished; not everyone agrees with me on that point, but I will cheerfully acknowledge some small degree of prejudice.

Before proceeding, perhaps some background would be in order.

In April 1964, the Committee on Scientific and Technical Information (COSATI) created a special task force to study ways to improve the processing and utilization of journal literature. Its work prompted the National Science Foundation in April 1965 to award a study contract to the Information Dynamics Corporation whose report proposed a serials data program for science and technology.

The directors of the three national libraries subsequently agreed to undertake the National Serials Data Program. Work on the early phases of this program was performed by the Library of Congress.

In May 1969, the U.S. National Libraries' Task Force on Automation and Other Cooperative Services was authorized by the directors to seek funds for a serials pilot project. The Association of Research Libraries agreed to administer such a project on behalf of the three national libraries, under policy direction by the Task Force.

We began with funding for one year, generously provided as a grant by the National Agricultural Library. With the exhaustion of those funds, financial support is being continued through June 1971 by the Council on Library Resources, the Library of Congress, the National Agricultural Library and the National Library of Medicine. As of June 30, 1971, the National Serials Pilot Project, as such, will be terminated and direct involvement of the ARL will cease; it is expected, however, that the ARL will continue to influence the later stages of the National Serials Data Program on behalf of its members.

At the outset, there were three major questions to be resolved:

1) How to define and limit our area of activity;

2) How to record our data;

3) How to obtain the necessary machine time?

Each of these, of course, implied other questions.

It was decided that we should limit ourselves primarily to live scientific and technical serials, since these would be of interest to all three national libraries, but that we should not exclude all ceased titles. We were to build a machine-readable file containing bibliographic data on such serials and were to include the holdings of each of the three national libraries for each title entered in our files. Holdings were to be reported to us by each of the three national libraries from checklists supplied to them by us at periodic intervals.

As for the manner of recording the data, we elected to employ the MARC serials format; since we were the first to make use of it, and since we were working with the Library of Congress, we thus became an effective field test for it.

Finally, as to machine time, the National Library of Medicine offered its 360/50 for our use. Becasue we are using remote-access typewriter terminals (ATS), however, and because the NLM computer is not equipped to receive such input, we are also using a 360/40 at the Library of Congress. Our terminals are linked by telephone lines to the LC computer; each week our input data are read onto a magnetic tape, which is then processed on the NLM computer. Although we are in on-line mode with the LC computer, we are really in a one-batch-per-week mode on the NLM machine. For practical purposes, then, our entire system is batch mode.

A caveat en passant: our COBOL programs, which are still incomplete, require main-frame storage for about 160,000 characters of instruction; were we to have time to complete them, we estimate that the programs alone would equal or exceed 185,000 characters of instruction, exclusive of data. Since few 360/30's or 360/40's approach such size, the significance of this is that you may require the size and power of a 360/50 if you are to use the MARC serials format and if your programs are to be written in COBOL. Storage requirements can, of course, be reduced by programming in assembly language, or by effectively resectioning the program package.

Our hardware configuration imposes certain restraints upon us. For example, we have character set limitations. It is true that our typewriter terminals can be used to produce character codes that the terminals, themselves, do not possess; it is true that the Library of Congress computer has an expanded character set which permits printing of almost all modified letters in the Roman alphabet; but it is also true that the National Library of Medicine computer lacks such an expanded character set. So we grappled with the problem of modified letters: we could input them, with some difficulty and with increases in time and costs, but we could not output them on either our terminals or on the computer used to process our data. Moreover, were we to code for them, numerous program changes or additions would be required so that the modified letters would be output on the NLM computer as unmodified letters, i.e., the computer would have to be instructed what to do each time it encountered a special code. In view of these considerations, we decided that in our special circumstances the modifications of letters had best be ignored.

Then we had to decide whether to input in upper case only or in upper case and in lower case. It was decided that the upper/lower case combination left us more options and was, in any event, more pleasing to the eye. I do not have statistical data to support my opinion, but I would guess that this decision has come near to doubling our costs. Consider: Our bibliographers must scan character by character and indicate for our editors which letters are to be capitalized; our MARC editors must repeat this scan; our input operators must be alert to editoral indicators for caps, and in revising we must once again study each character. In addition, only one of the two available printers has an upper- and lower-case print train. This sometimes delays the running of our jobs. Then, too, printing time is effectively doubled. Finally, far more inconsistencies result in our file, because our sources of bibliographic data are by no means internally or externally consistent in such matters as capitalization. Upper and lower case output is undeniably preferable, all other things being equal and/or cost not being a factor. Our experience indicates that upper and lower case input and output is simply too costly unless very special circumstances obtain.

The next major question we faced was whether to build our file from the holdings records of the three national libraries, base it on one or more published lists, or obtain a machine-readable file and reformat it.

Since we are working with the three national libraries and would be concerned with their holdings, basing our file on their serial records had some appeal, but we were to limit ourselves to scientific and technical serials. These would first have to be identified in the various serials files: no small matter. Besides, those serials files are in constant use by many people.

Working from an established list had some merit, but why could we not select an established list available to us on magnetic tape and reformat it? Would this not spare us a lot of key input?

So we examined the possibilities for reformatting. The National Science Library of Canada, hearing of our project, had offered tapes of the Union List of Scientific Serials in Canadian Libraries, Third Edition. We decided to accept its kind offer.

It took us seven months to reformat this list to our ATS output format, and then the reformatting was not complete. There are, after all, significant differences in machine-readable files, and some of these differences cannot be overcome via programming. In reformat programming, one must be able to identify data elements in the file being reformatted and equate them with data elements in the file to be created. But sometimes identifiers are lacking in the input file for needed data elements. In such cases, the computer cannot be instructed so that it can find what is wanted. There is no way to tell the computer what subfields are present or where they begin and end; there is no way to program into the reformatting such things as primary and secondary indicators, necessary things if you are using MARC; there is no way that a reformat program can identify and encode fixed-field data. This is not to indicate faults in the Canadian list; in my opinion, it is simply not possible to convert from a non-MARC format to MARC via reformat programming alone. Another point: to be really useful to us in reducing key input, the reformatted file would have to be directly accessible by our terminals, and in our case this was not possible. In view of our special circumstances, I would have to say that the decision to reformat was a mistake. We would have made more progress at less cost had we simply taken the bound volume of the Canadian list and worked from there. Given other circumstances, however, my view might be different.

It should be noted parenthetically that one simply does not take liberties with a complex format; one may neither substitute nor change it, although one may add to it. This is especially true of MARC. If changes or substitutions are made in MARC by a library, its file is likely to be incompatible with other MARC files. That would hardly be the way to arrive at a standard format.

Although we have made no alterations in the basic MARC format or in the meanings of its tags, subfields, indicators, and the like, we have made some additions which might be of interest. MARC records carry a machine-provided date-entered-on-file; this is changed each time any change is made in a record. It seemed to us that in a serials file it could be important to have such dates on a field-by-field basis, and so we added a subfield to each variable field. This additional subfield contains the date that that particular data element was last entered or updated.

We also felt that we should be able to trace our data back to the authority we accepted for that data and its form; and so we created an additional subfield for each variable field. In this we enter a numeric code that tells us which of (so far) 28 sources was our authority for that data element. Lest this number startle or surprise, I hasten to add that 17 of these 28 sources are files in the three national libraries.

Since I have mentioned sources, it would be well to add that we accept LC authorities as primary (but not as sole) authority for choice of entry and form. In many ways, being able to use what must be the largest and most complete authority files in the world is to our advantage. But the LC practice known as superimposition creates problems for us.

One of the differences between the Anglo-American Code and previous cataloging practice relates to entry under place. The change in this respect created problems for all libraries, but especially for one as large as the Library of Congress. There was just no feasible way for LC to make all the necessary changes in authority files. So, entries for newly established corporate headings are made in accordance with the new rules, while headings previously established according to the old rules co-exist in the same files. Previously established headings for corporate bodies are not changed unless the name of the corporate body is, itself, changed. For us, the result is one of our compatibility problems.

In the recording of holdings, it occurred to us that the usual and conventional methods might not be best for our purposes. For one thing, in a large machine file the increase in file space would be prohibitive even if only a very few libraries were to be represented. For another thing, conventional methods for representation of holdings data would imply continuous updating, and, if our data were to be reliable, this means permanent, formal reporting of all changes in holdings by each participating library. It would be naive to suppose that such an arrangement, even if it could be established, would last for long or would be equally well honored by all participating libraries. Therefore, we developed a very simple system for encoding holdings data for each library. In a special subfield (another of our additions to MARC) we enter a 0 if the extent of the library's holdings is not known; a 1 if its holdings are complete or substantially complete; a 2 if its holdings are substantially incomplete; a 3 if a title is held for a limited time only; or a 4 if it is received by the library but not held at all.

Staffing has been a problem for us. We are engaged simultaneously in two rather esoteric fields: electronic data processing and the serial literature. It would be too much to expect to be able to recruit people qualified in both these areas. So we have had to recruit for one field or the other and then supply the rest via training. The result is a highly skilled staff, each member of which can, in a very real sense, be thought of as an expert. We do not believe that our recruiting and training problems are unique. If you contemplate serials automation, you can also expect to encounter them and had best allow for training time in your scheduling. It is not a small factor. If not accurately calculated, it can wreck your schedules and cost estimates.

Despite all the cooperation we have had from the three national libraries, the National Libraries Task Force on Automation and Other Cooperative Services, the Council on Library Resources, and others, it must be admitted that our operation falls far short of ideal as a system. This is certainly not anyone's fault. But those of you who have automated operations where you share with others a computer facility, and perhaps supportive staff, can attest that such things as priorities (and libraries are usually low on the list), machine down-time, and the like, can become a major source of frustration. Consider, then, our set-up: typewriter terminals in our offices which can, and do, malfunction; telephone transmission in which background noise can alter the input signal; two computers, each heavily used, in two different agencies, two different locations 19 miles apart, and even within two different branches of the federal government. Add to all that the fact that we cannot directly access our master file, and you have a picture of a system wherein many components are involved and over which we have control of none. Hardly ideal. But one does not seek ideals in a pilot project: one merely tries to cope. Ideally, a library going into automation should have at least some degree of control over the men and machinery upon which it must depend. Certainly, the very minimum is guaranteed time year-round.

We have made progress. We have succeeded in demonstrating the technical and economic feasibility of a national serials data bank; we have field-tested the MARC serials format; we have created a base for standard serial numbers and, perhaps, for international standard serial numbers; in working with the National Serials Pilot Project, the three national libraries have reached higher levels of cooperation, and they have committed themselves to continuing the National Serials Data Program as a permanent operation.

By June 30, 1971, we will be delivering to each of the three national libraries copies of all our files (including our master file and both reformatted files received by us), copies of all programs used by us, detailed documentation of our automated systems, manuals of our procedures, and a final report summarizing our experiences, observations, and recommendations. These will then be used by the three national libraries in such ways as they see fit in the National Serials Data Program.

The National Serials Pilot Project was never expected to produce either immediate or direct benefits to the library community, and indeed it has not. But, as Phase Two of the National Serials Data Program, it has been a success, and the Program will, therefore, go forward. No one can predict with certainty the ways in which the National Serials Data Program will benefit all of us, but most will agree that the potential is there. As we move into Phase Three, many questions remain unresolved. Among these is the question: what do we want and/or need from it? You may be able to assist in providing the answer.

* * * * *

The National Serials System: Concept and Commitment

Mr. Lazerow: In June 1967, the national libraries set up their cooperative program. There were three major objectives announced at that time. One of these was the development of a national data bank of machine-readable information about serials.

From the beginning, therefore, the U.S. National Libraries Task Force on Automation has assigned a high priority to serials. It assisted in the development of the MARC serials format and it recommended to the directors of the three national libraries the establishment of a national serials system, the primary objective of which would be "to provide to qualified requestors in the U.S. timely access to appropriate portions of the world's serial literature." A pilot project leading to a national serials center was proposed, with the initial data base limited to scientific and technical serials, including new titles in the three national libraries, or to some segment of this universe, such as newly published scientific serials in English.

The Task Force saw a variety of potential products and services possible from a national serials system. The concept was entirely a "national" rather than a "federal" system, built from subsystems now operating more or less autonomously, and presuppossing a partnership of the public and private sectors, the academic and scientific communities, the publishers and distributors, and the libraries and secondary services.

In response, the directors asked the Task Force to develop a proposal for the National Serials Pilot Project. Submitted in May 1969, this proposal was aimed at production of a union list of the live scientific and technical serials held at each of the three national libraries.

The directors approved this recommendation and arranged with the Association of Research Libraries to operate the Pilot Project through a grant from the National Agricultural Library, with policy direction from the Task Force.

The national library directors last reviewed the Pilot Project situation on November 5. They agreed to provide joint support to the project for the remainder of fiscal 1971, with some help, if necessary, from the Council on Library Resources. At that time it was agreed that:

> Toward the completion of the ARL project, the three national libraries will review the continuing work that needs to be done in further development of a National Serials Data Program, including the relationship to progress in the application of the Standard Serial Number and plans for the administration of the International Standard Serial Number. Based on approval of a program that would attempt to use the data base and essential elements of the system developed by the ARL, the National Serials Data Program will continue development at the Library of Congress during FY 1972 at a minimum level of support of $72,000 for the year and perhaps in conjunction with an SSN project and/or ISSN administration.

On July 1, therefore, when the Project's developmental work and its documentation are transferred to the Library of Congress, we expect to go forward along the following lines, to the degree that financial resources permit:

1) On the basis of our evaluation of the content of the data base and the Project's findings, we shall expand this data base to include the remainder of the live scientific and technical titles held by the three national libraries. We would also hope by this time to be applying a unique identification code (SSN) to titles in this retrospective data base.

2) We hope to be able to enlarge the data base further by adding to it all new titles (regardless of subject), to which we shall, of course, assign SSN's. Procedurally, it makes little sense to begin building a machine-readable data bank while still allowing new titles to be added to the unconverted universe. We have already requested funds for this aspect of the project and hope to have them in hand by July 1.

3) We shall further expand the data base, as resources permit, and as conversion priorities dictate, to include all serials. This expansion, however, certainly has to be regarded as long-range and as requiring large amounts of money.

Our planning is based on the concept of a centralized, integrated national serials data base. Because of the nonstandardization of bibliographic data within the library community, a centralized editorial operation is necessary. In an integrated system, one must depend upon the largest contributor, which for this enterprise is the Library of Congress. Thus, this largest block of data, i.e., the LC data, becomes the standard against which other data are adjusted. It follows logically then that entries into the system from other sources must be checked against this central LC data store, and editorial decisions made to bring about a consistent data base. Actually, this is analogous to the present New Serial Titles process wherein the majority of the reports come from LC and other libraries' data are searched against the LC input. I should mention that there has been considerable debate within the Task Force on this issue; LC feels that in the long run this policy will prove the most productive for the research library community.

In addition, there are certain purely bibliographic issues which have received considerable attention. These are not new issues; they have been encountered many times by those engaged in centralized processing operations or the development of union lists. They are "library" problems and have little to do with automation per se, except that a computer is a slave to consistency and file inconsistencies will show up faster and present more problems in a machine-based operation.

The first of these bibliographic issues is the problem of choice of entry. There are some who contend that in a machine-based system it makes little difference as to which entry is chosen as main entry, and in a theoretical sense perhaps they are right. However, we're going to have to live with printed products for a time, and it is this factor that makes entry important. It will be necessary to determine the order in which the master record is to be printed so that adequate referencing may be provided.

Our plan is to input the LC main entry (again, because LC has the most comprehensive file of data for input), with cross-references pointing toward this entry. If there is no LC entry for a serial title, we will accept the entry given by other contributors, adjusting it if it conflicts with the data already entered into the data base. Again, this argues for continuing centralized editorial control.

A second bibliographic problem concerns the form of name used. In accordance with our concept of a centralized system, the LC form of name will be input when LC has established the name. This raises, of course, the question of how much of a name authority structure can be brought into the data base; the answer, to which studies now underway at LC will contribute substantially, seems to be the creation of a machine-readable central authority file to be used for all forms of material.

Another critical bibliographic problem, and one which is not yet resolved, concerns what, in library jargon, is known as the "successive entry" (or "split entry") vs. "single entry" issue. This is directly related to the assignment of the SSN. When a serial changes its name, is it considered as two serials, and hence should there be two records, each having its own SSN? Or is it still considered as one serial, and entered as one record under its latest name with a note as to its former name? Library practice varies. Before the Anglo-American Rules, most large research libraries would have cataloged the item as one record under its latest name; now libraries following the AA Rules would set up each name change as a separate record.

In building our data bank, several options are available:

1) Successive entry for all titles is a noble objective, perhaps, but this would mean in actuality that LC and other large research libraries would have to recatalog retrospective titles--a task that is certainly not realistic in economic or production terms.

2) Assign the SSN and input records on a successive entry basis from a designated current date on, but leave retrospective titles as they are (i.e., under latest title). This approach has much to recommend it, if libraries are willing to live with this inconsistency in SSN assignment methodology.

3) Enter every item under the latest title, and assign the SSN on basis of entity. This, however, would be inconsistent with the AA Rules.

4) Enter records under latest titles but assign the SSN to all former titles cited in the record and use a cross-reference structure for tracing purposes. Desirable as this alternative may seem, we must explain that this approach presents difficulties in showing relationships between several titles and SSN's within the same machine-readable record.

Another issue to be resolved is the level or amount of bibliographic information to be input. Should the content of the data base be limited only to the minimal information required for identification? We seem to have discerned the requirement for research libraries that at the very least the machine record should not carry less information than is in our present manual files. At this juncture, our view is that we should input as much of the available data as possible. This, of course, presents maintenance problems, and it may be possible to continually update on a systematic basis only those minimal elements (perhaps six) necessary for identification purposes.

We move then to the question of the feasibility of showing the location of holdings in the data base, and the degree of detail that can economically be tolerated at the national level. As to this issue, I can only tell you that we have reached no final decision. There are enormous economic constraints involved in the recording and updating of holdings in machine-readable records at the local, regional and national levels. We regard this, therefore, as a problem which we must resolve soon.

I am not going to burden you with detail about more problems except to say that they are sizeable, and that they have had and will continue to have our earnest attention. Some of them are not solvable unless we are willing to take some sharp departures from existing practices.

Ideally, in my view, a national serials system should function from one central source, with data from the three national libraries and from other sources flowing into the central facility. The data would be verified at the central source for conformity to the standard input. The SSN would be assigned at the time of input, and the tie-in with the international system would be achieved at this point also.

I must stress that the ultimate outlines of this national serials system cannot be finally determined at this juncture. While it may be unrealistic to expect the research library community to tell us in precise terms exactly what it wants from a mechanized serial file, the final designers have to know more about these expectations than is now known, and they have to be able to count on substantial financial support in order to begin a functioning system.

It is also unrealistic to expect solutions to come easily. Our experience has demonstrated that there is difficulty in constructing a consistent data base even when only three libraries (i.e., LC, NAL and NLM) are involved, a difficulty inevitably resulting from the differences in cataloging practices and policies among libraries, and this problem will be compounded, of course, when other data bases are merged eventually into the system. I believe that the goal of compatibility is more likely to be achieved if we are willing to make some compromises within our individual serials controls to achieve that compatibility.

The difficulty in which we find ourselves today comes from years of building individual files according to our individual patterns. For the first time, however, we now have a standard for a machine format. With this as a beginning, surely librarians should be able to push ahead to the goal of compatibility in serials control standards in order to achieve the service objectives all of us seek.

It is becoming plainer every day that the universe of serials has become too large and too diverse to be treated much longer by conventional patterns of control. The national libraries have taken the position that the machine-readable serials file offers an opportunity, which we must not lose, to input the data quickly, uniformly, and systematically. I believe that we can find the resources and make the decisions that will enable us to escalate this effort. We have to, because it is in the national interest to assign a high priority to the automation of serials controls.

* * * * *

Research Library Expectations of a National Serials Data Program

Mr. Budington: This seems a very appropriate season to consider what research libraries would like to see in a National Serials Data Program. It's not too long after Christmas, and we'd like to believe someone has said, "Yes, ARL, there is a Santa Claus." We're a little suspicious about who left the crumbs and empty Coke bottle. Many of us have positively seen Santa disappearing over the horizon, and we're not sure he'll be back. But if we're encouraged to write him a letter, I expect we'll still do it.

Our appetite for such a program has generally been whetted by two factors, and the salivation augmented by a third. Serials bibliography is notoriously frustrating. Its data elements are prone to continuing change, of an unpredictable, uncontrollable and unreported nature. Our first hunger, therefore, is for a source of dependable descriptive information on which to base our own records--our bibliographic access, if you will. Our second hunger is shared with the scholar whom we serve: where to get the elusive document which some library somewhere must have waiting for him--the final physical access. All of us know the trauma of establishing entries, of union list and catalog compilation, and the loan requests bounced endlessly around the research library circuit. The third factor augmenting our salivation is, of course, our faith in the power of the computer. We no longer believe this power to be infinite or infallible, but we do recognize the technical feasibilities. We also take some account of practical limitations, such as real costs, and of stepwise developments.

Our Santa Claus letter, therefore, probably starts by asking for the ideal serials data bank: an historically complete, verified, standardized, full bibliographic entry for every serial ever published; a location listing for all known files of each title; an accurate, updated record of holdings in these files; subsidiary information of an astounding variety about each title; and, finally, on-line remote access, and selective print-out capability. Our parents really know Santa Claus won't bring us this toy, and so they try to get the best they think they can afford and the store can supply.

I think we recognize that such a total, national serials data bank is not now possible, nor will it be for five?--ten?--twenty? years. Considerable study and exploration has taken place. Research libraries, many of which have sizeable computerized serials efforts under design or even operating, are beginning to chafe a bit. There is a growing fear of getting locked into incompatible systems. There is also a suspicion that the viability and acceptability of any so-called national proposal will be blocked by the development of other large systems, some widely accepted. Yet we know we are seeking the real, the final answer and that this cannot come overnight or in an immediately full-blown state. What, then, do we think is important, and what priorities do we assign?

The front runner is bibliographic data, a central store of authoritatively determined serial entries, with complete identification and history, adequate referencing and continuing file maintenance. Rationale for this bibliographic resource can be quoted almost verbatim from the shared cataloging program for monographs, and bears no repeating to ARL members.

Almost immediately, the form-of-entry controversy appears, generating magnificent and probably pointless heat. The existing vested and proprietary interests and loyalties will be maintained, regardless of any central operating decisions. It has even been suggested that the entry form in which a title is first proposed be adopted for that title--be it LC, Anglo-American, or whatever. The essential criteria are three: that all required data elements be present; that fully adequate referencing be provided; and, most important, that a unique identification code be assigned, a code which then ties together any and all variant entry forms. Any institution, provided with data elements from the national data source, can then tack them together to please itself.

Location information and holdings, while of vital interest, appear to be secondary. It is recognized that full centralized records of all files will not come about soon, if ever. (Consider the actual state of records in most of our institutions now.) It seems likely that the more complete location and holdings records may be expected farther down the line, in regional and local data files whose maintenance and accuracy are better assured. Referral to these files from the national file could be readily designed. This implies that a National Serials Data Program may incorporate a number of subsidiary sources, to achieve completeness of information at appropriate levels and locations.

The bibliographic store and the holdings-location information are the two obvious areas of interest in a national serials data program. In her working paper for Phase I of the National Serials Data Program (1967), Elaine Woods suggested a number of other services which the program might provide. These included assistance in cooperative acquisitions projects, in implementing microreproduction and preservation programs, in measuring inadequacy as well as duplication of coverage by secondary services, in issuing special lists by discipline, language or geographic origin, and, finally, in providing subsets for regional union lists or even institutional holdings. Provision for various other outputs designated as "of interest to management" have also been called for. Led on by the lure of computer storage and manipulation, it is tempting to add straws to this camel's back, and to shorten or lengthen them continually. The eventual effect on the camel is well known. (Parenthetically, I would not presume to draw any inferences on the design of camels, either.) However, each of these subsidiary proposals have requirements in software and hardware, and add incrementally, even geometrically, to the factors of cost and delay. The impatience and chafing of the user communities are not easily put down, and I believe it will be vital to keep priorities under control, particularly as to the immediate content of any data bank. This is not, by any means, to say that the capability for such activities is to be foreclosed, but that their immediate implementation not be permitted to drag down the program aborning.

The machine-readable character of the bibliographic data is naturally of great interest and concern to libraries and to the information processing and publishing communities. Those presently using or developing computer-based systems are wary of what may result from a national program. It is their hope that the threat of incompatibility will not materialize in irremediable form. The costs of any complete conversions are likely to be astronomical. The decision to go with the MARC development was a sound one--indeed, the only one which could rationally be made if we are to achieve any degree of bibliographic integration. And convertibility, or at least compatibility, has been added to some pre-existing systems already.

The on-call availability of machine-readable bibliographic serial data, then, is highly rated by research libraries. Those anticipating serial automation look for immeasurable help in having an existing file to build upon. The later addition of entries to local files may be similarly expedited. Not only are there enormous savings to be made in bibliographic work, but even the keyboarding may be eliminated. Obviously, any conversion to local practice will entail soft- and hardware costs, but once achieved may then provide ready input capabilities.

The whole character of a national data program carries the implication of progress toward the ideal of standardization. At long last we are permitting our guilt complex to emerge and to spur us toward common goals and common activities. We must make sure that the program does not just transfer to a national scale all of the frets and anxieties we have been wrestling with locally. The program must contribute to solution of root problems, and solutions will not come without the weight of standardization at the national level. Initially, there is wide reluctance to accept a new governing system, be it metric or MARC. But once we build our standard base, we will and are already finding it increasingly easier to accept further agreements on many matters. The intellectual benefits, not to mention the economic, are almost incalculable. The whole tapestry of cooperation and resource planning depends upon standardization and agreement. The national serials data program is an essential element in the weaving of that pattern. Acceptance of the program is also completely dependent upon soundly devised standards.

Of uppermost concern to the research library community is the assurance of continuing support for this program. If there is to be any semblance of planned development, there must be more than short-range, interim interest and financing. If there is to be any hope for logical progress, there must be more than patchwork criteria. If the priority objectives are to be achieved, there must be a minimum requirement of specific but peripheral functions, however flashy or politically motivated these may be. If there is to be participation by the library and bibliographic community, some semblance of continuity and stability is required. For no one can afford to put these kinds of eggs into string baskets.

No doubt our view over the past few years tends to magnify our hesitancies, for we have seen the ground shake and the sands shift all too often. The words most often heard in conversation with colleagues are "firm basis," "adequate assurance," and "long-range." The joint support now promised by the three national libraries is a positive indicator, although it came about only under pressure of dire emergency. Such support, indeed, is essential as an article of faith, visible evidence that the program has the genuine backing of our national libraries. Without it, the program is doomed.

As to the organizational structure of the National Serials Data Program, research libraries set no present specifications. There are obvious alternatives: a single, centralized resource, from which all information or machine-readable responses would be obtained; similar regional resources, duplicated at various selected locations in the country; a primary national center responsible for certain categories and levels of information and services, plus regional centers delegated other categories and levels of activity. Only research and study can determine such matters.

Neither can we now be sure of the proper location or governance of the program. It seems natural to think of the Library of Congress as its home, if we truly consider LC to be the National Library, already serving as the source of monographic bibliography and center of MARC activity. The proposal is also heard that the program be given independent status, perhaps under the administrative umbrella of HEW, with its own governing board. This matter is one which should henceforth be given serious consideration by the ARL, by other professional groups, such as ALA and the JCULS, and indeed by other parties outside the library community. Perhaps the National Commission will take the final decision; but it will need and must have our best thinking on this, as on other professional matters, when the time comes.

Without doubt, the research libraries feel deserving of a strong voice in the conduct of the national serials data program. Wherever its focus is placed, the concept must be accepted that the sheltering organization is not the final arbiter on procedures or even on matters of bibliographic content. The delegation of policy direction to the National Libraries' Task Force projects an admirable spirit of unity which, as previously remarked, is vital to assurance and acceptance. However, the program must not devolve into a project of and for the national libraries alone. It must retain the characteristic of broad professional support and participation. This can be construed as strong talk to those institutions from whence all goodness--especially money--flows. The statement is made not only from the depth of our convictions; it carries sincere respect for, and confidence in, their acceptance of a responsible national leadership role in this project of national and international significance.

One final suggestion concludes my remarks. While in the past certain publicity has been given to proposals and activities during Phase I at the Library of Congress and the ARL Pilot Project, there is no good general understanding of just what is going on. There is every indication of deep interest. In view of the three or four years that have slipped by without a great deal of visible impact, there is a desire to appraise the intent in the context of local systems and developments. The profession is looking for some technical appraisal, and a statement of objectives to suggest what may be in store for the future. It seems time for a reasonably thorough and objective survey of what the program has been, where it is, where it is going. Our colleagues in the field would welcome such an article, and it would probably not be harmful reading for the ARL representatives, nor even for your NSPP Advisory Committee.

Discussion: Mr. Kellam (Georgia): If I interpret your remarks correctly, Mr. Lazerow, a library which is beginning a program of automated serials control cannot expect much help from the National Serials Data Program for some time.

Mr. Lazerow: I think that is a correct inference. On the other hand, the development of such a program by an individual library will take considerable time. I suspect that before it is finished the program at the Library of Congress will be able to offer some assistance.

Mr. Kellam: What would be your advice to a library which is considering an automated serials control program.

Mr. Lazerow: My advice would be to defer the program until such time as the National Serials Data Program could be of real benefit to it. It should be possible in the future for a library to ask us for a tape which would provide bibliographic information on the serials holdings of that library. The Pilot Project has made a real beginning toward this goal as far as scientific and technical journals are concerned. Within a few years, we should be able to provide bibliographic information, the standard serial number and the identification number for scientific and technical titles. I should emphasize that this accomplishment is still a few years away, and that it would be limited to scientific and technical material.

Mr. Orne (North Carolina): I am pleased that the three papers on the National Serials Pilot Project have given the ARL membership a clear idea of the activities of the project and the future of automated serials control. I am alarmed, however, by the fact that within the last two months, there have been some decisions made at the international level which may invalidate the efforts we have been discussing here and which may take the whole matter of serials control out of the hands of the American library community. I also am alarmed by our tendency to ask the national libraries to solve our problems without informing them of our needs in such a way as to allow them to take the steps necessary to the solution of the problems. I suggest that this Association must come forth with some concrete recommendations with regard to serials control. Unless we do, our legitimate needs will not be met.

The international information community is attempting to establish an international serials data system. The French Government has agreed to provide $200,000 to establish a center for this effort in Paris. If the French are successful, the members of the ARL will simply have to accept the system which is developed. Anyone who is at all familiar with the operation of the French national library system should be very skeptical of what will result from their efforts to produce an international system of serials control. Admittedly, this is a personal opinion, but the situation is serious and I believe this Association must take action.

The National Serials Pilot Project has given us an extremely valuable base of information as to what can be accomplished with regard to automated serials control. We still don't know enough, however, about what we actually need. Bill Budington has stated clearly what must be done and how it must be accomplished on a cooperative basis, but Bill Budington's paper won't get the job done. The Association of Research Libraries must state its needs and what it is determined to have by way of serials control, and it must make this statement now.

We have been working through the established standards organizations, the American National Standards Institute and the International Standards Organization. Standards must be established for the basic elements of a bibliographic system. As we have worked, the MARC format has become a national standard and will be published shortly. The international standard book number has been agreed upon and has been approved as a national standard. These book numbers are appearing with increasing frequency. We have, then, a standard bibliographic format for monographs into which these standard book numbers will fit. Our next goals are an approved standard format for serials, and a standard serial number, which will fit into it and will allow libraries bibliographic access to the developing record. This record is something we can achieve now. If more can be done, well and good, but the standard record format and the standard serial number should be nailed down immediately. They will allow libraries to identify their serials and to so code them as to allow machine retrieval in a manner compatible with the procedures of every other library in the country. These objectives are possible now, but the ARL is not using its voice to assure their accomplishment. Unless we speak forcefully and quickly, our efforts will be preempted by activities at the international level and we shall lose whatever success we have had and could have in the future.

Mr. Haas: I think many of the ARL representatives here are aware of the specific problems you have pointed out. The advisory committee to the project is meeting on Tuesday morning and will give this subject its attention.

Mr. Locke (MIT): I am somewhat concerned by Mr. Johnson's advice that we use upper case only in our machine printouts. The printing industry has faced this question and has used both upper and lower case successfully. It has been forced to do this for reasons of clarity and convenience. I feel strongly that we should not accept the suggestion that we use upper case exclusively.

Mr. Johnson: I did not intend to make a specific recommendation. I was merely pointing out our experience with respect to costs. I prefer upper and lower case and would use it within any system which could afford it.

Mr. Lazerow: Let me say one word about the use of upper and lower case. I think it is a procedural problem. As yet, the Task Force has not had the chance to examine closely Mr. Johnson's procedures. We suspect, however, that the National Serials Data Program will use both upper and lower case. We have to make sure, however, that this will not involve us in greatly increased costs.

* * * * *

After a recess for lunch, Mr. Haas reconvened the meeting at 1:30 p.m.

Mr. Haas: There are two topics to be discussed this afternoon prior to the business meeting. The first is the ARL Preservation Project and the second is the problem of austerity budgets for research libraries. I shall speak briefly on preservation, since I am technically the director of the project. My few comments will form something of an interlude. In soap opera parlance, they form another chapter in the continuing drama of the hard working librarian pitted against technology, the polluted atmosphere and, in general, an insensitive world. I shall take a few moments to fill in the background of the preservation effort we have underway.

Although the campaign to preserve deteriorating library materials began long, long ago, serious efforts began in the late 1950's when the Council on Library Resources, led by Verner Clapp, began to support studies on paper deterioration at the Virginia State Historical Society. The ARL formed its Preservation Committee in 1960. Douglas Bryant and Rudy Rogers, who were members of that first committee, are still on the team. In recognition of their efforts, I had two ten-year pins made up. Unfortunately, they were made of paper, and they crumbled when I got off the plane at the Los Angeles airport.

In 1963, the Council on Library Resources funded a project, stimulated by the ARL Preservation Committee, which was undertaken by Gordon Williams. Its purpose was to determine the seriousness of the preservation problem in research libraries and to prescribe effective solutions. Following the report of Mr. Williams, the Research Triangle group made an assessment of the national magnitude of the problem. The Library of Congress, again with the support of the committee and funding from the Council, attempted to develop effective methods of locating acceptable copies of titles in poor condition in its collections. In addition to these activities, certain libraries--the Library of Congress, Harvard and the New York Public Library, among others--have used substantial portions of their own funds in an attempt to solve their preservation problems. Despite their efforts and those of other individuals and organizations, the problems are still with us. The solutions will be both complex and difficult.

Last spring, the Association of Research Libraries was awarded a small grant by the Office of Education to prepare detailed specifications for a national plan for the preservation of research library materials. This plan would deal with the details of the administration, structure, operation, bibliographic procedures, and all of the other very wormy characteristics of a truly national preservation plan. After several months of work, it is clear that our report will focus on four topics that will govern the progress of preservation efforts. These topics might be called the "Four M's."

The first is the Mission of the plan and the agency which would carry it out. This part of the report will build on the recommendations of the Williams' report, which were approved in principle by the ARL in 1965.

The mission leads to our second topic, the Mechanics of the organization, which will be operating in a context of research libraries. The third and fourth "M's" are the Methodology of operation and, most importantly, the

Money needed to carry the plan forward.

Now the mission is reasonably clear, and the methodology will be flexible and subject to change as preservation techniques become available and as opportunities present themselves. The two critical topics are the mechanics of the organization and the money. The mechanics we shall have to work out, but you can give me some information today about money.

A very short questionnaire is now being passed out. I ask that each ARL representative fill it out now. It will take only a few moments of your time. You will notice that the questionnaire reflects my personal bias that progress toward the solution of the preservation problem at the national level will require a firm commitment from the research library community. Let me assure you at this point, however, that your comments on the questionnaire will not be engraved in stone; you are not being asked to sign a binding contract at this time. In fact, you need not even sign the questionnaire. What I hope to determine is your response to my assumption about the need for this commitment from research libraries, and here I am speaking about a financial commitment, not a moral commitment. My conclusion may not be valid, but I should be aware of its viability before concluding work on the report. If I am wrong, a different direction must be taken. It is possible that you will tell me that we can't take any direction at all.

The questionnaire should provide a sense of this group on four questions. The first is the seriousness of the preservation problem as seen by you, the directors of research libraries. Is it a critical problem in your libraries or is it of only moderate importance? I suspect the answers will vary among libraries, depending upon their age, location, etc.

The second question asks you to estimate the percentage of your budget for collection development and maintenance which you feel should be devoted to preservation efforts within your library.

The third question is fundamental. Do you feel that the preservation problem is serious enough to warrant individual institutional participation in and support of a national plan to solve the problem?

Lastly, what percentage of your budget for collection development would you be willing to contribute on an ongoing basis to a national agency which would deal with the problem?

I realize that in the final analysis your answers to these questions will depend on a variety of considerations. At this time, however, I am simply trying to get a general consensus. Your answers will be a great help in determining the content of the final report. Thank you.

Our main program item this afternoon deals with the problems of austerity budgets. We have asked Douglas Bryant, certainly the most austere librarian with budgetary problems, to chair the panel discussion.

Mr. Bryant: If ever there were a problem common to all of us, it is austerity budgets, and we are going to face it for a number of years.

Each of our five panel members is a director of a university library. Each will speak to the budget situation in his own institution, commenting on the specific difficulties he faces and the solutions--if there are solutions--which he is attempting to implement. Our panelists are, in order of appearance: Mr. Warren Boes, of Syracuse; Lewis Branscomb, Ohio State; Frank Grisham, Joint University Libraries; Rudy Rogers, Yale; and Jim Skipper, Berkeley. We shall begin with Mr. Boes.

Budget Constraints at Syracuse

Mr. Boes: Syracuse University is one of the private institutions which is reported to be heading for financial difficulties. The library has known of this, since we have seen no real growth in our budgets for the last three years. We expect more austerity next year. Beyond that, we anticipate a higher priority. We expect our new administration will get its financial problems under control and we shall open our new main library and begin to see some returns from our planning.

After this fiscal year we will have better budgetary control and will be able to carry fund balances over into the following financial year. In addition, we have examined our components and will recommend that the library change some of its priorities. We believe that we must review some services which have a limited immediate clientele, although their reputation and value extends beyond the campus.

For example, fine items in the field of manuscripts and rare books have been at the mercy of collectors and investors for some time. They have shown annual price increases of 30 percent. It is no real service to scholarship to broadcast parts of special collections among several institutions, particularly when conditions of financial stringency limit their accessibility. The answer would seem to be the establishment of cooperative research centers for such material, so that we may avail ourselves of economies of scale.

Syracuse has been an active participant with Cornell, Rochester, and the State Universities of New York at Binghamton and Buffalo in a consortium, the Five Associated University Libraries. It has seemed to us that greater definition of our research concentrations, both in our own systems and as a group, has enhanced our value to our users at less cost to each. We can see before us clearer collecting parameters and better deployment of specialists. A shorter collecting spectrum gives more focus to the components retained. This permits better definition of those areas which are best left to a sister institution, or which require cooperative facilities.

Our planning has been greatly influenced by economic considerations, and our years of stringency have conditioned us to organize for budgetary control. What we seek is accountability. Each of our public service department heads will be budgeted separately to meet his objectives, and will be assessed his proper share of processing and administrative costs. While administration will remain a relatively inflexible percentage of our general expenditure, processing costs are subject to considerable fluctuation, depending on:

1) Cooperation with other agencies

2) The extent of computer-based systems

3) The depth to which cataloging is carried.

All three of these considerations must be seen in the light of economic reality.

Personnel costs have been rising at a far more rapid rate than machine costs. Up to now, most extensive internal automation has relied on soft money. Yet machines represent the only way for us to hold down personnel costs and enter the new communications era. The implication is that there has to be a shift in the proportion of budget allocations from personnel toward systems and networks, if not within library budgets, then within university budgets. The average percentage for staffing costs must come down and the real percentage afforded to communications systems must go up.

The control of research library budgets centers on personnel costs. People take the lion's share of the money. The current search for status, quality, and for wider services is aggravating the budgetary situation. For the impecunious library, higher salaries means fewer salaries, unless the budgetary distribution is to be distorted by increasing staff expenditures at the expense of acquisitions. We can see the beginnings of a shift from the professional to the technical associate grades.

When our new building opens next fiscal year, we will no longer have our facilities spread all over the campus. We are looking for the operational benefits of decentralization along with the economic advantages to be gained from centralized facilities.

The outlook for future budgets at our institution is a positive one. In New York the private institutions are being helped by Bundy money. It would seem a reasonable expectation that in the coming years the allocation of these funds will increase. It would also seem reasonable to us to make similar grants of operating funds directly to research libraries, which are recognized to be extra-institutional units in a state and national network. In the State of New York we have high hopes of receiving increased support of this type through a highly developed regional research system of the State Library.

At a time when the federal government is proposing to change the distribution of its educational funding, might it not be opportune to press for a fair share of moneys to be channelled directly to research libraries (possibly following the practice of the State of New York), outside the usual institutional channels? Certainly cooperative facilities and processing centers ought to be within the realm of public funding.

Syracuse University is one of those private institutions reported to be headed for financial difficulty. We have a fine administration working to bring the problems under control, and we expect them to be successful. The libraries of the University have been treated fairly during the last several years, and we are assured of high priority when we open our new main building in 1972/73. Our years of stringency have conditioned us to organize for budgetary control, to try to contain personnel costs, and to seek cooperation with our sister institutions. We also believe that the cost of a research library should not fall entirely on the parent institution.

* * * * *

The Financial Situation of the Ohio State University Libraries in 1970/71 and Beyond

Mr. Branscomb: I want to preface these brief remarks by reminding ARL librarians of the grim findings of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education last fall in its study of a sampling of forty-one colleges and universities across the nation. You will recall that about one-third were found to be in deep financial trouble, another third were headed that way, and a final third seemed to be weathering increasingly rough economic seas. Other parts of the Commission's study indicated that these percentages applied roughly to the nation's colleges and universities as a whole. With about two-thirds of us in trouble or headed in that direction, it seems very appropriate that we discuss the situation, commiserate with each other, and share information and ideas as part of our effort to provide the best possible library services under conditions of austerity. It has been suggested that substantial assistance for higher education will depend in part on how well the colleges and universities convince the public that they are being managed efficiently, in the public interest, and with a reasonable compromise between order on the one hand and student dissent and academic freedom on the other.

In Columbus the Libraries are operating in the present fiscal year on a tight, but not austere budget. All budgets were modestly increased last July 1. However, unlike previous years, the University has not had funds that could be tapped by the libraries or other departments during the year for emergency needs, and as a result we have had to curtail or eliminate for the present the following:

Installation of a new book detection system;

At least temporary cessation of issuing book lists and the "Libraries Notes" to the faculty;

Reduction in the total amount of funds available for the purchase of library materials;

Elimination of a full-time professional position in the English Graduate Library, one in documents cataloging, and one half-time in the Browsing Room.

The University last fall requested of the state legislature budgets totalling a 33-1/3 percent increase over those of the current year, but realistic expectations at this point indicate that we will probably get about the same amount for the new biennium as for the present one, which means a de facto cut. Among the factors involved in this pessimistic prediction are:

1) The general revolt of taxpayers locally and nationally against increased taxation. (Note the number of school levies which have been voted down.)

2) Use by the Legislature of the riots and disruptions in Ohio's state-assisted institutions last spring as an excuse for no increases.

3) The fact that no substantial increase in state funds is possible under Ohio's present tax laws and changes in these laws cannot be anticipated soon.

4) The necessity for Ohio State to share the "pie" with newly formed state-assisted universities, technical institutes, et al.

5) The unhappy combination of a Democratic governor and a Republican legislature.

State funds for capital improvements, except those already funded, are almost in the zero class. Total funds this year for the acquisition of library materials, including state money, federal grants and gifts, are below those of last year and I expect them to be even lower in the new biennium.

As we study the situation in Columbus, we have to anticipate some of the unpleasant results of austerity budgeting. As stated before, there will almost surely be a reduction in the number of items of library materials acquired because of the reduction in acquisition funds. We anticipate the establishment of very few, if any, new positions and there is the definite possibility of eliminating some vacant positions with obvious deleterious effects in service to patrons and in the prompt preparation of materials. It seems highly unlikely that we will make any progress in our requests for an addition to the Main Library to provide relief for the critical stack situation and the growing shortage of public service areas and staff work space. We have already made the decision not to increase our beginning salary which now ranks us in the present year as 24th out of a total of 76 ARL university libraries. There will be few library faculty salary increases and those will have to be restricted to the critical cases of very high merit, with the consequence that we may lose some staff, particularly those at the middle level. Reduced travel funds will result in fewer professional staff attending stimulating conferences, workshops and the like. A less tangible, but quite important, result of austerity may be the drop in morale within the library faculty, although this might be mitigated somewhat by the fact that our sister institutions throughout the nation are in pretty much the same boat as we. Finally, while not related directly to the Libraries' program, our strong drive for the establishment of a library school at Ohio State will almost certainly be approved by the University's Board of Trustees, but will likely be turned down by the Ohio Board of Regents since funding has been tied to approval.

My library colleagues and I have been discussing ways in which we may economize and so stretch our dollars further. They are:

1) Eliminate some less essential vacant positions;

2) Cut back on our current imprints (blanket order) programs on a subject and/or duplicates basis;

3) Rigorously restrict library faculty salary increases to a select few on a superior merit basis;

4) Use the new data and guidelines that we have recently prepared to reduce some less essential budgetary items in some department libraries and in some areas of the Main Library;

5) Effect some staff savings through the on-line catalog program of the Ohio College Library Center effective 1 July 1971;

6) Deposit in the Center for Research Libraries some carefully selected categories of very infrequently used material;

7) Increase the pace of interuniversity cooperation in such projects as the university consortium on 1970 census computer tapes;

8) Take greater advantage of scientific management techniques.

Coupled with the need to decide upon economy measures is the happier approach of considering ways to increase budgets. One way is to step up our efforts to secure more support from friends of the library, alumni, foundations, and similar sources. Perhaps federal sources should be included although the prospects here look dim. I think it is safe to assume that other institutions and their libraries will be doing the same thing so that the competition for support from these sources will be keen.

At Ohio State the best possibility of increasing funds seems to me to be the presentation to the University's central administration of better documented budget requests in an effort to increase our share of the pie from the present 2.3 percent of our institution's total general and educational budgets. An increase to 3.3 percent would provide an additional $1,695,625 which would go a long way toward ameliorating our austerity program.

With a wry face I admit that at least two possible advantages may derive from the austerity program which we are moving into. In the first place, it will force us to do a better job of budgeting and of using our funds more efficiently. Although we didn't realize it at the time, we have been living in relatively affluent times. The second advantage is that we will undoubtedly regain what independence we think we may have lost to the federal government in accepting federal support. For some of us this is not much comfort because I don't think the federal government is yet running our universities to any marked extent.

* * * * *

Problems of Austerity at JUL

Mr. Grisham: The Joint University Libraries is a cooperative enterprise which jointly owns and operates the libraries of three adjacent institutions: George Peabody College for Teachers, Scarritt College for Christian Workers, and Vanderbilt University. Its existence was established in a Trust Indenture adopted by the three respective Boards of Trust in 1938.

Prior to the adoption of the Indenture, it was generally felt that interinstitutional cooperation would be fundamentally important to the developing university center in Nashville. Pooling library resources would mark the beginning of a true research library and would give the students and faculties of three divergent institutions the library resources normally available only at much larger universities. In the last thirty years, JUL has become something of a model of the benefits that may be received through library cooperation. In the two and one-half years I have served as director, I have received fourteen inquiries from institutions interested in similar developments.

To understand the problems of financing the JUL, it is necessary to note its four main sources of income.

1) Endowment. Although small, it has its own endowment, which until recent years, covered the maintenance costs of the main library building.

2) Formula I. Each of the constituent institutions contributes a minimum sum for each student enrolled.

3) Formula II. To balance the budget, this flexible formula of support was adopted and based on the number of graduate and professional programs.

4) Supplementary appropriations. These were designed to meet extraordinary needs. An example is the $1 million Vanderbilt gave us for retrospective purchases.

There has never been general agreement on these formulae as adequate or equitable forms of support. In fact, the Board of Library Trustees, which governs our system, has asked for recommendations, for its spring 1971 meeting, on a completely new base or formula of financial support. The Board is seeking a financial arrangement that will assure library development based on income formulae which more fairly and accurately reflect the relative usage and benefit to the three constituent institutions.

Specific JUL budgetary problems are many. We not only have all you librarians have, but those extra problems inherent in a cooperative enterprise. For instance, the Booz, Allen & Hamilton report notes the disparity of expectations existing between librarians and university administrators. Think of this disparity multiplied threefold, and all the resulting pleasures.

But permit me to make these pointed observations:

1) Under our current funding structure, JUL is only as strong as its weakest institution. Our Formula II requires $1 from Peabody sources for each $3 from Vanderbilt.

2) The multiple funding structure, with its accompanying problems is glaringly evident in JUL as third party sources enter the arena.

3) In budget preparation, we must work with too many segments of the three institutions. In 1970/71, 72 percent of the budget was negotiated and that with twelve different deans or budget officers. The Vanderbilt Senate Library Report of 1970 states, "The JUL funding structure should be amended so that the disparate and complex budgeting processes of the individual institutions will not affect the orderly development of collections and services." It also called for more fixed and less negotiated income.

4) The financial officers of the three institutions do not adequately understand our budget. For them, the adage is "What you don't know, hurts." Meaningful communication is the key to this problem.

5) The JUL must bear the total cost of maintenance of its main library facility.

There are many solutions being suggested for relieving our misery. The grant from the Council on Library Resources has been a godsend in our planning and development process. The staff supported by this program has spent six months of concentrated study on the financial problems. We are most fortunate to have this support. Of course, we intend to follow the traditional avenues of attack such as cooperation. Just before I left Nashville, there appeared on my desk a memo from the presidents of two neighboring institutions, namely Fisk and Meharry Medical College, requesting information as to how they might become the fourth and fifth members of JUL. This has come about through the Nashville University Center Council, sponsored by the Ford Foundation, with which we discussed cooperation. Of course, we will look at new technology, centralization of technical processes, efficiency in operation, new modes of support such as service fees and friends programs, usage surveys and the like.

Again, permit me to focus your attention on several specific thrusts that represent our attempts to increase the service delivery capability of JUL as we a) increase income, b) decrease costs, and c) improve the cost/benefit ratio of operations.

1) Increase the endowment. Last week I asked the Board for permission to launch a $5 million drive for this purpose. There is the inevitable problem of JUL competing for the same dollar one of the institutions may have its eye on. However, I have raised certain money that was not available to any of them.

2) Increase Formula I. It has not been increased since 1956, while during the same period, the tuition at Peabody has doubled and at Vanderbilt it has tripled. Formula I should be immediately doubled with this additional stipulation: When the tuition at the parent institutions has advanced 5 percent, the Formula I rate should be increased 5 percent.

3) The administrative costs are carried as a separate entity and funded from pooled sources. They should be spread or distributed to all segments of the budget.

4) Establishment of a permanent research and development unit. After the CLR grant expires in three years, our present plans call for a full-time assistant director for research and development.

5) Seek state funds. This may seem strange for three private institutions. There is a strong movement in Tennessee, that is certainly not unique, to convince the State Department of Education that it would be more economical to lend financial support to private schools of higher education than to continue to build to meet rising enrollments in state schools. It is beginning to catch fire. Future federal support will, in many areas, come through this channel.

6) We are researching a theory, new to us, that financial support of technical and reader services ought to be divided. Why not tie reader services to student enrollment and support it with Formula I? Technical services could be related to the ambitions of the various programs and the ultimate objectives of the University. Tied to the book funds, it could be supported with Formula II.

7) To strengthen our position in the competition for a greater share of the academic dollar, the JUL has adopted program budgeting and plan to have it implemented as soon as possible. It is not a cure-all, but we do feel it offers a way to express requests which not only will be given fuller attention but which will be better understood by the fiscal officers who pass judgement on our budget. I know you have seen the new federal guidelines which ultimately will require program budgeting of our institutions for them to receive federal support. You will remember Tom Mason's excellent paper on this subject, presented to the ARL in 1969. Also, John Keller addressed the University Library Section of the ACRL on this subject in 1967. PBS will enable us to more accurately measure the costs and benefits of activities and services.

As the JUL began looking toward program budgeting, it recognized the need for comprehensive cost data which were not readily available. On July 1, 1969, we installed a process cost accounting system which includes precise allocations of administrative overhead, plant maintenance and other supportive operations. With its time and motion studies, this system is providing the historical costs associated with general programs and services, which are vital to program budgeting. These basic data enable us to make work flow analyses, and develop work standards and controls, including production goals.

An adjunct of PBS and cost accounting is the insatiable need for accurate, timely and meaningful statistical data. Rather than burdening our staff with data gathering responsibilities, thereby defeating our own efforts at economy, we have developed the capability of obtaining the needed statistics as a by-product of established operating procedures and reports. Also, the data are refined into categories paralleling university programs. This is done in accessioning by assigning costs per volume by discipline, and by detailed cataloging statistics which identify the cataloger and the type of cataloging done. We are convinced this information will expand our knowledge of the types and levels of library staff required to achieve the various objectives assigned the JUL.

A survey report of the JUL, dated 1951, stated, "We believe that each institution in good faith should consider the Joint University Libraries as a legitimate child, fully entitled to adequate support." So, all these efforts are dedicated to the end of proving our legitimacy, our right to demand a fair share of the university dollar.

* * * * *

Adversity and Opportunity at Yale

Mr. Rogers: The Yale University Library, like many others, is sharing in the financial crisis that confronts our universities. I think it fair to say that we are being given special consideration by the administration because the University regards library development as a priority effort. Put another way, we are suffering less than some other parts of the University, including instructional departments.

The present crisis hits the library at a particularly difficult time. Special grant funds that have been supporting area studies are running out, and almost $200,000 is needed from other sources to continue at the present level. Counterbalancing this, we are fortunate in receiving rather substantial windfalls in the form of major gifts that have become available at this time. These monies will help to lessen the impact of adversity. Nonetheless, we are having to make some very real cuts in our budget base.

To the greatest extent possible, we have sought to cut peripheral operations that would do the least possible damage to central programs such as collection building and processing. The provost and I are in complete agreement that cutting book funds would be foolishly shortsighted. Yale did this in the thirties, forties and fifties and is now spending substantial sums to repair decades of neglect. We do not wish to repeat this error.

I offer the opinion that a little adversity is not the worst thing that can happen to an organization. Having a little less money than one thinks he needs sharpens decision-making. Over the years, we all undertake programs or create ongoing activities that are of questionable validity. Department and branch heads can be very defensive about these things until the real crunch comes and they are forced to make choices. As a "new boy" at Yale, I questioned the necessity of certain things and met fairly firm opposition to converting professional positions to nonprofessional, reducing personnel in certain places that seemed overstaffed, or discontinuing marginal services. In the present emergency, most of these problem areas have been put to rights, not through fiat but through the choice of subordinate supervisors. As an example, we offered an elaborate panoply of accessions lists in various disciplines and linguistic areas. These literally cost tens of thousands of dollars. They were among the first things to go, and their disappearance so far has hardly caused a ripple.

It also seemed to me that there was an unusual amount of duplication of books and particularly of journal subscriptions at Yale. We have reduced subscriptions by over $30,000 simply through a rigorous reappraisal of needs. I don't think this is going to seriously impair service. In one case, a microtext edition of Chemical Abstracts stood in the same room as the print copy. Many science journals were traditionally continued in the Sterling Library although there is a central science library. Also, there were five subscriptions to a journal in the field of crystallography (at a cost of $140 each) in science libraries within a few hundred feet of each other. Reductions like these are not impossible to sustain.

I could give other examples of savings, but I do not want to labor the point. I wish the money we have now "saved" were available for new acquisitions. Our acquisitions funds are $300,000 to $500,000 below other comparable libraries, disregarding expenditures for rare books and manuscripts that make us appear deceptively well off. In this sense I lament the budget cuts, but they have not been a total loss and, hopefully, some day we can rebuild on a firmer base than would otherwise have been the case.

* * * * *

The Poverty Level at Berkeley

Mr. Skipper: The present budgetary agony at Berkeley is a consequence of a state economy which has been severely depressed by cutbacks in the aerospace and defense budgets; a state political situation which resulted in the disclosure immediately after the Governor was reelected that the state deficit was at least twice as large as had been announced before the election---all of which is compounded by a campaign promise against new state taxes.

These economic facts are amplified by a public disenchantment with higher education in California, and, I suspect, in many other areas of the country. Science is no longer looked upon as sacrosanct; higher education must now compete with poverty and environmental programs; because of inflation, there is a reluctance to expand the federal budget; there is a continuing revolt against higher property taxes; and student radicalism in the past several years has been followed by a lack of confidence and a significant backlash in public support of colleges and universities. These factors are well documented in a recent report written at Berkeley by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education concerning the new depression in higher education on the national level.

All of these negative aspects are exacerbated by increasing costs in universities approximating 11 percent per annum, which result from expanding enrollments and economic inflation.

As a consequence of economic and political difficulties, the Berkeley library budget has also suffered. Last year the Regents terminated the summer academic quarter in an effort to reduce expenses. As a result, the library lost twenty FTE's on an annual basis. Berkeley also had to open its new undergraduate library this fall without a sufficient number of new positions, thus requiring the transfer of six FTE's from existing units. The result was the need to close all services of the library system on Friday night and Sunday morning, with the exception of the undergraduate library.

Last November, the Governor of California imposed a freeze on filling vacancies in all state agencies except the colleges and universities. As of 17 December 1970, the President imposed the same freeze on the University. This means that no existing or future position vacancies can be filled unless an exception is granted, and we have been informed that such exceptions will be very difficult to obtain. Our immediate difficulty comes from an annual turnover rate of 50 percent in full-time supporting staff and a 75 percent turnover in student assistants.

What can the library do to absorb these cuts? First, it is obvious that we must defer new programs, such as indicating storage location in the public card catalog for a half million volumes. We must abandon the public card catalog information desk, and continue to live with a cataloging arrearage. The anticipated benefits from our library automation program will be delayed.

As the budget for books, periodicals, and binding was not cut, we must maintain reasonable staffing levels for these units, which involve approximately one-half of the library personnel, or create processing backlogs which will be a mortgage against future personnel budgets. Following the loss of the summer school supplement and having to staff the undergraduate library, we are already stretched too thin in public service units. However, it is in this area that most of our savings will have to be made. Unless general exceptions are made in filling vacancies, hours will have to be substantially reduced in our thirty-one reader service units.

Although we have not seen the Governor's recommended budget for next year, the library is preparing for the worst while hoping for the best by planning for a 10 percent budget cut with options in priority order for additional funds which might be available. We have tried very hard to maintain staff morale in our present situation, although it is difficult.

My assumptions for the future are: 1) We are not likely to see the rate of budgetary increases in higher education which were characteristic since Sputnik, unless the Russians do us a second favor in stimulating national interest in research and higher education; and 2) the present emergency situation will probably phase out within the next five to seven years and we will return to a level of budgetary equilibrium, although it will be below that of recent years.

I must confess that Berkeley's new depression is too recent for the library to have done more than temporize in an effort to ride out the storm. If, however, the depression becomes more serious than I anticipate, academic libraries will be called upon to seriously analyze many assumptions about collection development and services which have been taken for granted in the past. Rather than just reefing financial sails, we may find it necessary to redesign the entire ship.

However, my present conclusion is that, at this time, it would be premature to sell!

* * * * *

Mr. Bryant: Before accepting questions from the floor, I want to ask for a show of hands on three questions. The first is which libraries represented here face, as far as they can now tell, an actual dollar reduction in their budgets for fiscal 1972? I see approximately a dozen hands.

Second, which libraries anticipate a continuation of approximately their present funding level for fiscal 1972? If I count correctly, there are about twenty-four hands.

Third, which libraries anticipate a budget increase for fiscal 1972? I count twenty-nine. That is a surprisingly good showing. May I ask how many libraries are not far enough along in their budget presentations to be able to determine the figure for next year? About five or six appear to be in that category.

We are fortunate, this afternoon, in having Mr. Skipper with us, since he has recently spoken with Mr. Earl Cheit, who you will remember is the author of the Carnegie Commission report on the financial difficulties facing institutions of higher education. The report is to be published next week. Mr. Skipper has seen the entire manuscript and I have asked him to comment on it at this time.

Mr. Skipper: The most I can do is to give a quick summary of Mr. Cheit's document, focusing on that portion which has application to large research libraries.

As you know, the report, entitled New Depression in Higher Education, deals with three categories of institutions: 1) those which are judged to be in financial trouble; 2) those which are headed in that direction; and 3) those which seem to be financially stable.

The indicators of financial difficulty or stability which emerged from discussions with financial officers are rather mixed. There doesn't appear to be one factor which determines the financial situation of any given institution. A great deal depends on the various funding sources, endowment, and commitments to instructional and research programs which vary widely in their costs. If I may oversimplify a bit, the report indicates that the institutions which are in financial difficulty tend to be the larger urban institutions with extensive and sophisticated research programs, with high salary levels and which are characterized by excellence of both programs and faculty.

Mr. Cheit begins his report by pointing out the difference between our present economic situation and the depression of the 1930's, in the hope that something might be learned from the past. This comparison manifests the difficulty of analyzing our present situation. Our depressed economic circumstances today defy the economic "laws" which until now have been used to explain depressions. You will remember that in the 1930's both prices and income fell together. In fact, Mr. Cheit points out that prices fell even more sharply than wages.

The exact opposite is true in our present situation, in which all economic indicators--with the exception of the stock market on occasion--go up, while income is going down in terms of purchasing power. One specific result of the recent stock market decline is that the investment portfolios of private universities have lost value.

There are also a number of new factors in higher education not present in the 1930's which make the financial difficulties of institutions of higher education even more difficult. The first is student aid. In looking at the budget of my university, I have been amazed at the amount of money expended on this program. The effect is to drain off funds from other portions of the university. For example, in 1960 the library at Berkeley received 6 percent of the general education operating budget. This year we are getting about 3.1 percent. Part of the reason for this reduction is the money needed for student aid and minority opportunity programs.

Universities also are supporting such expensive operations as computer centers, which, in many cases, cost as much as the university library. Another factor is student unrest. At Berkeley, 4 percent of the operating budget was needed to accommodate the results of student unrest last year. Further, there are new concerns for the environment. Mr. Cheit states that this concern cost the University of Chicago an extra $2 million. The University of California is much concerned about the student living conditions in an area known as Isla Vista, and a large amount of money will have to be spent to correct an unsatisfactory situation.

Increasing faculty salaries are a big factor in the economic plight of colleges and universities. During the 1940's and early 1950's, faculty salaries tended to increase by 3 or 4 percent a year, while industrial wages were rising about 4 percent. During the 1960's, faculty salaries were increasing at a rate of 5 or 6 percent. They were rising faster than the general consumer price index.

Then there is the simple fact of increasing enrollments in colleges and universities. Educational aspirations have risen in the general population and will continue to do so.

In the face of all of these increased cost factors, we find a decline in federal support for higher education. We need only look at the reduced amounts available to colleges and universities from the National Science Foundation, which has been tremendously important in funding scientific programs. What, then, are the strategies for the future? The university presidents, to whom Mr. Cheit talked, gave some answers.

The first tactic is to place a moratorium on new programs. Secondly, whenever possible, vacancies on the staff are not filled. The next step is to maintain present programs, but to cut their budgets, which in nearly all cases results in a decline of quality. The last and most extreme step is to drop existing programs entirely. This, of course, causes all sorts of problems, relating to tenure, student displacement, etc. In some cases, it won't save much money at all.

One positive approach, as opposed to the negative ones just cited, is risk-taking. During the relatively affluent times of the 1960's, a number of quite marginal universities attained quality and even excellence because of skillful management of soft money. It produced programs which attracted endowments and gifts. In view of this, some educators are saying that it is simply too difficult to drop existing programs and to rebuild them at a later date. They contend that the best thing to do is to risk some capital to support existing programs and hope that the present financial difficulties will pass fairly soon.

Mr. Cheit concludes that, if institutions of higher education are to continue to grow at previous rates, they will have to have budget increases of approximately 10 percent per year. This means, of course, a 10 percent increase in income. He expects that increased income will approach 5 percent. If he is correct, some serious trimming has to be done in colleges and universities.

I should mention before closing that Mr. Cheit makes very little mention of the problems of university libraries. His analysis, nevertheless, is quite interesting.

Discussion: Mr. McDonald (Connecticut): My question is addressed to Rudy Rogers. There is more than a little nervousness among ARL members about the results of the financial crunch we are now in. Frank Grisham mentioned service charges as one source of revenues. At Yale, you have a very high use fee for persons outside the Yale community. Are you considering the possibility of placing a charge on interlibrary loans?

Mr. Rogers: I have an unhappy reputation as a result of the fact that Yale has raised its borrower's fee from $25 to $500. I wouldn't care to have you read some of the mail which I have received as a result. It is true, however, that I think we have been giving away services that could be paid for and I doubt we can continue to give them away indefinitely. For example we are instituting charges for use of the library by industry, as have a number of you. We are trying to bring about more realistic arrangements with reprint publishers. We expect to charge publishers who want to use prints and photographs for reproductions. We librarians must see to it that some of the publishers' profits made through library cooperation must come back to the libraries. Now to the question of interlibrary loan charges.

A number of us have been concerned about this problem because interlibrary lending is costing the larger libraries a significant amount of money, perhaps in the realm of $50,000 to $100,000 a year. This is the type of expenditure that concerns university administrators. It won't be long before we must do something about it. Until this time, I haven't been able to persuade anybody else that we ought to do anything about it and, frankly, I have done all the pioneering I wish to do with that $500 fee. Consequently, I don't see any early move in this direction, but I think a charge for interlibrary loans would be a legitimate one.

When I served on an advisory committee to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, I tried to persuade those who make decisions that it was in the best interest of everyone to build into federal aid programs some kind of incentive for the big libraries to continue to make their resources freely available. If this kind of incentive were carried far enough, it would help libraries keep their individual programs under control, so that each of them wouldn't be trying to emulate the Library of Congress. We did get some consideration, but now the rules of the game of federal support of academic libraries are completely changed. Consequently, it just might be worth discussing within the ARL the possibility of at least a nominal charge for interlibrary loans.

Mr. Bryant: I wish to add a word on this matter. As nearly as we can determine at Harvard, the outgo per year of unrestricted money--which is the most precious kind of money--in support of interlibrary loans is $100,000 at least. The library is now under pressure from the corporation to recover at least a part of this sum and that pressure will become greater as the financial stringencies become more intense. The Harvard use fee has gone up this year, from $200 to $300, and I am not sure we won't go up again. Interestingly enough, as far as we can tell there has been no reduction of the income from use fees. There are fewer licenses out, so to speak, but the income will remain between $45,000 and $50,000 a year.

Mr. Humphrys (New York State Library): Mr. Bryant has mentioned yearly costs of interlibrary loans. Has a unit cost been determined?

Mr. Bryant: We are working on that. We did a study last summer at Harvard which indicates a unit cost on the order of $5 a loan. The present ARL study of interlibrary lending should produce some extremely useful and reliable information on this question.

Mr. Berthel (Johns Hopkins): Mr. Rogers, has your $500 fee been in effect long enough to determine what effect it is having on the number of applications for use of the library?

Mr. Rogers: As might be expected, there are fewer people taking advantage of this "privilege." On the other hand, some universities are underwriting this cost for certain of their faculty members. We arrived at the figure of $500 because we feel it reflects the actual cost to the library of service to an individual. If one divides our total budget by the student and faculty population, a figure of about $595 is reached. Consequently, we felt a $500 fee would be fair.

As you all know, the percentage of the university population, which really uses the library intensively--and this has been tested by studies made a number of years ago--is about 30 percent. If you divide your cost by that percentage you will find out, as we did at Yale, that the cost per intensive user is closer to $3000. It is to be expected that the initial reaction to a sharp rise in fees is a reduction in the number of users. Eventually, however, you will have more than before. A case in point is the significant increase in the dues of the American Library Association. Another is the increased charges for catalog cards imposed by the Library of Congress. After the increase, more cards were sold than before, although this pattern has not continued for different reasons. I think that in the future our income from use fees will be considerably larger than it has been in the past.

Mr. Jackson (Pennsylvania State): For publicly supported universities, additional funds might result from a closer relationship with the state library.

State legislatures are now demanding better use of the funds available to state institutions. They look upon cooperative or coordinated programs as a means whereby money will be used more efficiently. Recently, there has been a marked increase in the amount of state funds available to the state library for this type of program. Some of it goes to larger university libraries, which may provide contractual services for private institutions. I believe this is a growing trend and those of us in the state supported institutions should try to find better ways to use this money which the state libraries now have. This means better working relationships with them. For decades, we have not communicated very well. It seems to me that these improved relationships ought to be actively supported by the ARL.

Mr. Downs (Illinois): About five years ago, the state legislature of Illinois passed legislation which appropriated $100,000 for each of four reference research centers. These centers are the University of Illinois Library, the Southern Illinois University Library, the Illinois State Library and the Chicago Public Library. These appropriations were in recognition of the fact that most of the interlibrary loans in the state come from these institutions. This money can be used for the purchase of materials which the libraries decide is needed to support this service.

Mr. Forth (Kentucky): We have been talking about relatively small charges to users and relatively small funds from other agencies. These will not solve our problems.

If you have the opportunity to examine the budget of your university, you will be appalled at the amount of money that is being spent for nonacademic functions. At the University of Kentucky, $600,000 a year is spent on the student health center; $50,000 subsidizes the student newspaper, which helps the university not at all; and an enormous amount of hidden money supports the athletic program--I speak as one to whom the director of athletics was responsible for a while. These are large chunks of money, and I think our trustees will have to make a decision as to what the university is all about. They will have to decide whether they want a library or whether they want to babysit their students. I wonder if we are asking the right questions of our friends on the faculty and in the central administration. I don't think that we are. The heart of the matter is the priorities established within the institution.

Mr. Metcalf: Interinstitutional cooperation appears to me to be a very important element in the solution of our problems. I am struck by the fact that twenty years ago, Harvard, after charging a $5 fee to outsiders for 72 years, raised it to $10 a year. It is now $300 a year and Yale is $500. These increases cannot go on forever.

For years the library profession struggled to get a certain amount of support from the federal government. Finally, in 1965, we won a modest victory. Since that time, we have benefited from federal funds in improving our library collections and facilities. This support has come without any federal interference with our research libraries. Isn't now the time to make a concerted effort to obtain federal funds for interlibrary cooperation? This cooperation is essential, but federal funds are necessary if we are to implement it.

Mr. Lorenz (Library of Congress): Mr. Metcalf's point is well taken. I think it is significant that in the extension of the Library Services and Construction Act, which passed in the last session of Congress, Title III, which provides funds for interlibrary cooperation, was neither eliminated nor consolidated. It remains as a separate entity and funds provided under it to the states need not be matched. This indicates the degree of interest in interinstitutional arrangements on the part of Congress. I also believe that the authorizations for this title are in increasing amounts for each of the next five years.

Mr. Rogers: There are two small points I wish to make. The first is that I am encouraged by the fact that at least on some campuses university administrators are beginning to see that the only way to reduce library costs is to reduce academic programs. This is a beginning at least.

The other point is that I feel one of the solutions to our budget problems would be the development of a Boston Spa type of operation in this country for serial literature covering all disciplines. I am tremendously impressed--negatively so--by the huge cost of serial subscriptions and of handling those subscriptions. I would certainly like to see the Association start doing something about this matter.

* * * * *

BUSINESS MEETING

Election of New Board Members

Mr. Haas: The first item on the agenda of the Business Meeting is the election of three new members to the board of directors. Mr. Buckman will present the report of the Nominating Committee.

Mr. Buckman: Mr. President, in accordance with the bylaws, the Nominating Committee has reported to the membership prior to this meeting. The report stated that the following persons agreed to be nominated. They are: Ben C. Bowman, University of Rochester; Ray Frantz, University of Virginia; Arthur McAnally, University of Oklahoma; Ralph E. McCoy, Southern Illinois University; and David C. Weber, Stanford University.

Mr. Haas: Are there any additional nominations from the floor? Let the record show there are none.

The tellers for the election are: Howard Rovelstad, University of Maryland, and John Berthel, Johns Hopkins University. You will note both gentlemen are from the same state, one representing a public university, the other a private university. I thought this a good device, since Messrs. Rovelstad and Berthel are watching one another constantly, anyway. Will you please mark the ballots now being distributed and return them to the tellers.

[After a short interval, President Haas announced the results of the election.]

Mr. Haas: The following ARL representatives have been elected to the board of directors for three-year terms: Ben Bowman, Arthur McAnally and David Weber.

Election of New Members to the Association

Mr. Haas: The Membership Committee recommended to the board of directors that four institutions should be invited to join the Association of Research Libraries. They are: Howard University Library, the National Library of Canada, Rice University Library and the Smithsonian Institution Libraries. Mr. McCarthy wrote to the directors of each of the libraries and I should like to read his letter, because it will serve to remind all of us of our obligations to the Association.

> At the initiative of the ARL board of directors, I am asking your permission to have [name of library] proposed for membership in the Association of Research Libraries at its next meeting in January 1971.... Membership is open, upon invitation of the Association, to major university and certain other libraries which collect on a comprehensive basis and give evidence of institutional capacity and commitment both to support the purposes of major research libraries and to aid in solving the problems characteristic of them.

> To guide the board and the membership in reaching a decision, would you please indicate whether or not you would accept an invitation, on behalf of [name of library], to become an ARL member. In so doing, would you be prepared to pay the ARL dues (currently, $1500/year), represent the library personally at ARL meetings and participate in the affairs of the Association? Your response to these questions would be most appreciated.

All four institutions have agreed to the conditions of membership. On behalf of the board of directors, I submit their names to you for action. Is there any discussion?

Mr. Hamlin (Temple): This is a confession of ignorance on my part, but I know very little about the Smithsonian Institution Libraries. Could you give us some information about them?

Mr. McCarthy: A good deal of information about the libraries was gathered by the Membership Committee, regarding size of collection, budget, services and projected programs. Unfortunately, I do not have that information with me at present. I can speak, however, to a few specifics. The appointment of Russell Shank to the directorship of the libraries was intended by the Secretary of the Smithsonian, Mr. Ripley, to signal a change in the attitude of the Institution towards its libraries. Their budgets have been more than doubled and their activities have increased substantially. There is every expectation that once the current financial difficulties have been overcome, the Institution will go ahead with its long-range plans for library development. Mr. Shank and others have assured us that the Smithsonian is quite serious about its intentions. They also have pointed out that in certain subject fields the collections are of national importance. I did mention to Mr. Shank that these collections were perhaps not widely known. He agreed and stated that the libraries are considering programs whereby a wider segment of the scholarly community will be informed of the collections and services. Without the documents in hand, this is all the information I can give you at present.

Mr. Locke (MIT): I should like to speak to a general problem, namely, this matter of informing prospective members that they are being considered for membership before any information about them is made available to the membership. We are being asked to vote on libraries whose qualifications are quite unknown to us. I am somewhat surprised at Mr. McCarthy's answer to Mr. Hamlin's question. It would appear that the nomination of the Smithsonian Libraries is based on hoped-for results, rather than proven abilities. I don't believe this has been the custom in the past.

Mr. McDonald (Connecticut): I submit that a budget which has been increased by 100 percent in two years illustrates a clear commitment to develop a comprehensive research potential. May I ask Mr. McCarthy the size of the budget before it was improved?

Mr. McCarthy: $500,000.

Mr. Hintz (Oregon): I suppose it is only natural that those of us who have suggested new members who have not been nominated should wonder why. We are curious as to the reasons for their exclusion. There never has been any communication from the board on this subject. Recently, I nominated a particular library and to this day I don't know why it was not selected.

Mr. McCarthy: I can assure Mr. Hintz that the institution he nominated was given consideration. Unfortunately, when compared to other nominees, its standing in a number of categories was too low.

Mr. Haas: It appears we are ready for the question. All those in favor of extending invitations to membership to the four recommended institutions signify by saying, "Aye." Those opposed? Let the record show that the nominated libraries were approved unanimously.

Mr. Boes (Syracuse): The questions which have been raised about the nominating and election procedures are important. Could we consider a change in those procedures? As matters now stand, any of us who has questions about the nominees cannot have them answered satisfactorily before a vote must be taken. Is it appropriate to discuss this matter now or should it be taken up under new business?

Mr. Haas: Your question relates directly to the next item on the agenda and can be taken up after Mr. Powell presents the report of the Membership Committee. In accordance with the bylaws, the membership received more than a month ago a proposed amendment to Article II, Section 2 of the bylaws which deals with membership in the Association. Mr. Powell will speak to the proposed amendment.

Report of the Membership Committee

Mr. Powell (Duke): I have been asked to present the report in the absence of our chairman, Mr. Vosper, who is ill.

Our committee, which was an ad hoc committee, was asked by the board to look into this matter of criteria for membership in the ARL for university libraries. As you can see from the amendment which we have proposed, our recommendations are not broad or sweeping, but we hope they will contribute to a more precise interpretation of the present bylaws relating to membership. May I say at this point that we feel that the membership criteria always have been fairly objective.

I served on the Membership Committee thirty years ago, when there were only about thirty members of the Association. At that time, the Executive Committee functioned as the Membership Committee. We screened institutions proposed for membership and passed our recommendations on to the membership for vote. On one occasion, a senior member of the committee questioned the advisibility of nominating a particular library because he thought its director would be an obstructionist. To prove our objectivity, we nominated the library and the membership approved at the next meeting. As you can see, personalities have never really figured strongly in membership deliberations.

Admittedly, the membership criteria for university libraries are not a cut-and-dried affair. There are, however, certain objective standards which the Membership Committee and the board of directors have always taken into consideration. These standards do not always tell the whole story and there must be some flexibility in considering new members.

Article II, Section 2 of the present bylaws reads as follows:

> Major university libraries are considered to be those whose parent institutions emphasize research and graduate instruction at the doctoral level and which support large, comprehensive collections of library materials on a permanent basis. In evaluating potential university library members, the board of directors will give consideration to the following objective criteria: the number of Ph.D degrees conferred; the number of distinct disciplines in which the Ph.D degree is offered; the amount spent for books, periodicals and binding; and any other criteria which the board of directors may deem desirable for purposes of evaluation.

The proposed amendment inserts the clause, "And grant their own degrees," in the first sentence. This consideration has been implied through the years. The amendment merely makes it explicit.

Further, the amendment proposes adding, again as part of the first sentence, the following: "And which give evidence of an institutional capacity and commitment, both to support the purposes of major research libraries and to aid in solving the problems characteristic of such libraries." We feel this language emphasizes the responsibilities of the member institutions as well as their rights.

The amendment also substitutes the word, "guidelines," for the word, "criteria," in the second sentence. This has been done to obviate the assumption on the part of some nonmembers that if certain objective criteria are met, membership is automatic. This change in langauge is closely allied to that stating that the parent institution must grant its own degrees. There are today universities which have been formed by a number of formerly separate institutions coming together as one entity. The resulting library combination has large resources in terms of number of volumes and total expenditures, but it does not constitute a true research collection, and the combination could not actively promote the work of the Association. We feel that the language of the amendment clarifies this situation by providing clearly stated guidelines and by allowing the board of directors and the membership the necessary flexibility in nominating and electing new members.

Mr. President, the Membership Committee moves adoption of the amendment to Article II, Section 2 of the bylaws of the Association.

Mr. Haas: Is there any discussion?

Mr. Forth (Kentucky): Would these guidelines as stated in the amendment be published and be applied to all institutions?

Mr. Haas: If adopted, they would be part of the bylaws which is a public document.

Mr. Kellam (Georgia): What guidelines are used in considering non-university libraries for membership? They would have to be different from those used in considering university libraries.

Mr. Haas: There is nothing specific in the bylaws relating to non-university libraries. Mr. McCarthy informs me that there never has been.

Mr. Kellam: I wonder whether or not guidelines should be developed for this kind of institution?

Mr. Haas: Your question indicates that the board should consider this matter.

Mr. Branscomb (Ohio State): I should like to move an amendment to the amendment. It does not involve a substantive change, but I believe it would clarify matters. You will note that the proposed guidelines include, "the amount spent for books, periodicals and binding.' I should like to change that wording to, "The amount spent for library materials and binding."

Mr. Haas: Is there a second to Mr. Branscomb's motion? There is a second.

Mr. Branscomb: The phrase, "books and periodicals," has not been truly descriptive for a long time. Libraries collect other types of information resources, such as audiovisual materials, which are very important.

Mr. Haas: Those in favor of Mr. Branscomb's motion to substitute the phrase, "the amount spent for library materials and binding" for, "the amount spent for books, periodicals and binding," please raise your hands. Those opposed? Let the record show the motion carried. Is there any further discussion of the amendment as amended?

Mr. Locke: I should like to read a letter I sent to the Membership Committee after receiving the proposed amendment. This is the quickest way to put before you my reaction to it.

> As I understand it, one of the aims of the subcommittee in its revision of Article II, Section 2 is to make the qualifications for membership more vague, 'to obviate the assumption on the part of some nonmembers that if certain objective criteria are met membership is more or less automatic.' In this aim, you certainly succeed. In my opinion, however, ARL should abandon this elitist attitude and establish clear, automatic criteria for membership. I would be happy to argue this point.
>
> To satisfy the second aim, to 'clarify the position of the Association on the matter of applications from newly created consortia,' you add the words, 'and grant their own degrees.' I do not believe this will

> do the trick. You will probably have to face the issue squarely and say something like: 'Libraries belonging to consortia or members of consortia will be judged on the basis of how well they conform to the spirit of the bylaws.'
>
> With respect to the third aim, 'give evidence of an institutional capacity and commitment, etc.,' the wording is vague and I would suggest that it not be added to a sentence which defines major university libraries, but rather that it be placed among the guidelines at the bottom of the page.
>
> As a final minor point, may I suggest that you eliminate the word, 'guidelines,' from the end of the second line of the second paragraph and end it after the word, 'following.' This is on the grounds that the factual data aren't guidelines.

To sum up, I should like to come back to the principal points which are that we ought to have a more democratic organization here; that we should establish objective criteria for membership; and that any library which meets them should be admitted to membership. This procedure would obviate the present situation in which the membership cannot get specific answers as to why some libraries are nominated for membership and others are not. I think the membership criteria should be clearly spelled out.

Mr. Haas: Is there any other discussion of the amendment?

Mr. Boes: I am still worried about procedural problems. Is there anything in the bylaws which forces us to proceed on membership as we now do? Wouldn't it be possible for us to have information on possible members before they are contacted by the ARL office? As matters now stand, it is my understanding that after the board decides on certain candidates, Mr. McCarthy writes to them and asks them to join before they are voted upon.

Mr. Haas: That is not what happens. They were not invited to join the Association. Mr. McCarthy communicated with them and asked if, in the event the membership extended an invitation, would they accept it given the provisions of membership as outlined in Mr. McCarthy's letter. Let me quickly explain the process whereby a library is nominated for membership.

Every two years, a membership committee is formed by the board. It reviews those libraries which have expressed an interest in joining the ARL. It is also free to review other libraries which it chooses to identify as possible candidates. Using the provisions for membership in the bylaws and moved by the spirit of the Association--that's "spirit," not "spirits"--this committee does an awful lot of hard work putting together relevant data. Their conclusions are transmitted to the board, which takes action on the recommendations. At that point, the institutions approved by the board are asked whether they would, in fact, be willing to assume the obligations of membership if they are voted for membership. They are not invited to join before action is taken on their candidacies by this group.

Mr. McAnally (Oklahoma): I think a better procedure would be to inform the membership about those libraries recommended by the Membership Committee before the candidates are contacted. We should be supplied with the pertinent data which supports the recommendations of the Membership Committee. I am willing to make a motion to that effect, either now or later under new business.

Mr. Haas: You certainly may make that motion.

Mr. Gosnell (NYU): It seems to me that the critical point of this discussion was reached when we were talking about "vague guidelines" or "objective criteria." Mr. McCarthy stated, previously, that Institution X was not nominated for membership because it was too low on the list of factors considered by the Membership Committee and the board. Perhaps a definition of what is "too low on the list" would clarify matters.

Mr. McCarthy: I shall try my best. The particular instance to which Carl Hintz referred took place two years ago. The Membership Committee compared candidates to the ARL membership in terms of volumes held, total operating expenditures, degree programs offered by the institutions, number of doctorates granted, etc. The candidates were measured in these areas against those ARL members who were the weakest in these areas. Those that didn't either equal or exceed those ARL members were not considered.

Now this took place two years ago. Consequently, I cannot be any more specific because I do not have the relevant documents with me.

Mr. Haas: Is there any further discussion on the amendment to Article II, Section 2 as amended? We are ready for the vote. Those in favor of adopting the amendment to Article II, Section 2 as amended please raise your hands. Those opposed? Let the record show that the amendment carried.

Report of the Library of Congress

Mr. Lorenz: There has been a major change in the federal budget for FY 1972 which is very important to all of us.

The Department of Health, Education and Welfare did request funds for Title II-C for 1972. The Office of Management and Budget deleted these funds during its final review. The Department of HEW informed us of this change as soon as it happened, just forty-eight hours before the budget was to be put in final form.

We held a series of emergency meetings at the Library of Congress to determine how we should react to this development. Our decision was to amend the budget of the Library and add to it the amount that HEW had requested. This amount is now in the budget of the Library for fiscal 1972. In other words, the executive budget will be decreased by the amount HEW requested, and the budget of the Library of Congress will be increased in the same amount.

Action relating to II-C has been occurring in the legislative committees. Those Congressional committees concerned with higher education legislation are now considering an extension of the Higher Education Act. The bills which have been submitted include an extension of II-C with the funds appropriated directly to the Library of Congress, rather than to HEW for transfer. There has been no definite action on this proposal, but it is under consideration by committees of both the House and the Senate.

At this point, there is so much that is undecided that the best course of action would appear to be for the Library of Congress to keep Mr. McCarthy informed as developments occur and, at the appropriate time, ask him to notify the ARL membership as to what might effectively be done.

Mr. Milczewski (Washington): What reason was given by HEW for the deletion of II-C funds from its budget?

Mr. Lorenz: The reason was that agencies who administer programs should request funds for those programs in their budgets. We have in writing from HEW that the action taken by the Office of Management and Budget in no way reflects upon the merits of the National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging. It is also true that the Senate Appropriations Committee made this same comment when it reported on the budget for FY 1971. They felt it would be wise for administering agencies to request funds in their budgets for their own programs.

The problem we face is that the extension of the Higher Education Act may not take place before July 1 when funds for II-C will be required by the Library of Congress to continue its administration. Action on the budget of the Library of Congress probably will be taken by the appropriate subcommittees in April and May. Frequently, however, legislative actions and budget actions are not completed before the beginning of a fiscal year. The agency then usually relies on a continuing resolution. In this case, however, there would be nothing in the budget on which a continuing resolution could be based, because the funds for II-C are not at present in the budget of the Library. We think there is a possibility, and probably a good one, that because of the generally favorable attitude toward this program in the Congress, something could be written into the continuing resolution which would enable us to continue to receive funds for the program.

Mr. Milczewski: Is it important that there be an extension of Title II-C in any higher education legislation that may be passed, assuming that it would call for the appropriations to go directly to the Library of Congress?

Mr. Lorenz: I am glad you asked that question. I neglected to say that we put II-C funds into the budget of the Library of Congress on the basis of the authority of the Library to acquire, catalog and distribute cataloging information, which we have, in fact, been doing since 1900. We hope that authority will not be challenged. It could be challenged, however. In that case, we would have to rely on specific legislation, either in the extension of the Higher Education Act or in specific legislation for the Library of Congress, alone. If we could not get specific legislation, we would lose the amendments to II-C, which give us authority to spend administrative funds to acquire materials for other libraries. Keep in mind that we have not really been able to implement those amendments because of lack of funds.

I am sure that we all hope that what may be a short-term problem will turn out to be a long-term advantage.

Mr. Jackson (Pennsylvania State): Do you have any comment at this time on cataloging-in-publication?

Mr. Lorenz: The Council on Library Resources has been considering making a grant for CIP in the amount of $200,000. There has been some indication from the National Endowment for the Humanities that it would be prepared to match that $200,000 and, perhaps, add another $200,000. If all of this money were forthcoming, we would have $600,000 for the program. Last week, we filed a request to the National Endowment for funding support. Its board will meet on February 15, at which time we hope it will reach a positive decision on what may be done for us. We also have started discussions with the Office of Education about a grant which would allow us to evaluate this program. Our present hope is that, whereas we have relied previously on the Council on Library Resources for support of CIP, we will be able to obtain funds from a variety of sources which will allow us to see CIP through until we are prepared to request and receive federal support.

Mr. Clapp (Council on Library Resources): Make it clear, John, that the Council would give you the money if it had it.

Mr. Lorenz: That is right. The Council at this time does not have the funds to support the entire program.

Mr. Haas: We all owe the Library of Congress our thanks for its efforts to bring CIP into being.

Interlibrary Loan Study

[Mr. McAnally, chairman of the advisory committee to the Interlibrary Loan Study, read his report which appears in these Minutes as Appendix J.]

Meeting of the Committee on Research Libraries of the ACLS

Mr. Bryant: The meeting of the American Council on Learned Societies will take place next week in New York. For the first time, a portion of the meeting will be devoted to research libraries. Specifically, on Friday morning, there will be a panel discussion which has been organized by the Committee on Research Libraries. The panel will be chaired by Fred Burkhardt, president of the ACLS. There will be three panelists: I will discuss the question of building resources for research libraries; Ralph Ellsworth will speak to the problem of national bibliographic access; and Gordon Williams will comment on physical access to materials.

We think this discussion will present an opportunity to show the commonality of interests between the scholars in the humanities and social sciences, who rely on library resources, and the research libraries. After all, neither the scholars nor the libraries exist in a vacuum. They must form a team if scholarship is to be advanced; we must attempt to get rid of the "we-they" situation which has characterized our relationships all too often. This meeting of the ACLS is, therefore, particularly important for our purposes.

Report of the Office of University Library Management Studies

Mr. Haas: As chairman of the Joint Committee on University Library Management, I have submitted a written report of the activities of the committee and of the Office of University Library Management Studies. I want to take this opportunity to introduce Duane Webster, who assumed the position of director of the Office on October 1. I am sure you read about his appointment in the "Newsletter." Mr. Webster is rapidly getting baptized in the business of research library management investigation, working with the Booz, Allen & Hamilton study team at Columbia. Mr. Webster will comment on his activities in this project.

Mr. Webster: I should like to explain the role of the Office of University Library Management Studies in the investigation of the organization and staffing of the Columbia University Libraries. As you know, the study at Columbia is financed by the Council on Library Resources. I am participating in the study on a full-time basis, working with the study team and reporting to Mr. Haas. This is a particularly useful arrangement, because not only am I gaining valuable experience in the library management field, but my activities should form a solid basis for determining the future activities of the Management Office.

The project at Columbia will produce three different reports. The first will be a client's report for Columbia. The second will be a report of the study for national distribution, which will indicate the possible application to other libraries of the findings at Columbia. A third will contain a list of recommendations for future activities of the Management Office. It is understood that these activities must have the widest possible impact on university research libraries. I would welcome any suggestions from ARL representatives regarding the library management functions which should be given priority in future studies.

Mr. Haas: Mr. McCarthy will now present his report.

Executive Director's Report

Mr. McCarthy: I should like to mention a few topics which have either not been discussed or have been discussed only briefly. The first is higher education legislation.

At present, the picture is confused. As you know, the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended in 1968, expires as of June 30, 1971. Because of wide differences regarding its extension, there may not be a new higher education bill by that time. The information I have received indicates that there may be four separate higher education bills introduced. One will be an administration bill, which no one in the higher education community in Washington has seen. We are certain that when it does make its appearance it will not contain a provision for the National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging, Title II-C.

A second bill is being prepared by the staff of Senator Pell. We understand it would be largely an extension of the existing Act, with some modifications, of course. We have been told that it will continue Title II-C as part of higher education legislation, but with the appropriation going directly to the Library of Congress rather than to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

The picture is even more confused in the House. Higher education legislation is handled by the Special Subcommittee on Education, Mrs. Green's Subcommittee. There has been a great deal of wrangling among the members of that Subcommittee. As a result, it did not introduce a bill during the last session of Congress. In an effort to overcome this difficulty, Congressman Perkins, chairman of the larger Education and Labor Committee, has his staff preparing a bill which he hopes will be acceptable to the several factions within Mrs. Green's Subcommittee. Our expectation is that Mr. Perkins' bill will be very similar to Senator Pell's

It seems certain that the fourth bill will be introduced by Congressman Quie of Minnesota, the ranking minority member on Mrs. Green's Subcommittee. This bill probably will be very similar to that which was introduced by Mr. Quie in the last session. If it is, it will provide for an extension of Title II of the Higher Education Act. There will be a change with respect to Title II-A. It is somewhat complicated and I will not attempt to explain it now. Titles II-B and II-C will remain as they are.

We don't know how long it will be before the situation is clarified. We certainly will do our best to put forward the views of the Association to the appropriate committees. We will be calling on you to assist us by contacting your Congressmen and Senators at a future date.

Another legislative matter of interest to the Association is the extension of the Library Services and Construction Act, particularly Title III of that Act which provides for interinstitutional cooperation. One of the provisions of the new bill is that states are required to form state advisory councils on libraries to work with the state libraries or the state library agencies in improving library services within each state. These councils already exist in certain states and, I believe, some ARL representatives are members. ARL representatives should be alert to the formation of these councils and, whenever possible, should seek to serve on them. Membership will assure consideration of the needs of research libraries.

Another legislative matter of importance to all of us is the Tax Reform Act of 1969. As you know, one of the provisions of that Act prohibits tax deductions for gifts to libraries by an individual of his personal papers. All of us are aware that there have been abuses in this area, but the cure is worse than the disease. We are certain that this provision has had a deleterious impact on research libraries.

There is a move, just now getting under way, to amend the Act in this regard. The Association will take appropriate action in support of this effort. In order to do so effectively, we need precise documentation from the membership regarding gifts of papers which either have been lost or deferred because the individual cannot claim a deduction. We hope to build up a record of such instances. Some of you already have supplied information to the office; we shall need a good deal more to strengthen our case. You can be assured that confidentiality will be observed whenever necessary. It is clear that the attempt to amend must have a broad base of support. This Association can supply an important segment of it.

The membership should be aware that the Association has been asked to establish a liaison between it and the emerging Association of Science Information Dissemination Centers. This was discussed by the board of directors yesterday. It was agreed that this matter should be explored further because these information centers, whether administered by libraries or independently of them, are concerned with document delivery and, in nearly all cases, it is the library which is the instrument of delivery. We hope that some useful contacts can be established and that we shall be able to give you a more extensive report within the next year.

Mr. Haas asked me to report on two recent committee appointments. James Henderson, of the New York Public Library, has accepted the chairmanship of the Committee on Copying Manuscripts. Dr. J. Boyd Page, president of the Council of Graduate Schools, has agreed to replace Dr. Arlt on the Microfilming Dissertations Committee.

Mr. Haas also asked me to refer to the report of the Library Security Committee which was given to the board at its meeting on Saturday. Part of that report was a lengthy outline of security items which must be taken into consideration by library administrators. The board agreed that this outline would be helpful to the membership and that it should be mailed from the ARL office at an early date. The board has under consideration several other actions recommended by the committee. Decisions on these matters will be reported at a future meeting.

New Business

Mr. McAnally: I should like to speak, again, to the topic of the procedures involved in electing new members. Specifically, I move that the Membership Committee submit to the membership the names of institutions which it has recommended be invited to join the Association, along with the data pertinent to that recommendation, and that this information be given to the membership in advance of the meeting during which a vote will be taken. A second part of this motion is that no recommended library be notified that it is being considered for membership until after formal action by the Association, and by that I mean a vote of the entire membership.

Mr. Haas: Is there a second to that motion? The motion has been seconded. Is there any discussion?

Mr. Heron (Kansas): I hesitate to speak against the motion since I believe that the membership should be fully informed as to the criteria, especially the quantitative criteria, used to determine invitations to membership. On the other hand, quantitative criteria do not tell us everything we need to know about a library. It is difficult to measure quality and yet it is central to consideration of a library for membership in the ARL. I fear that a general discussion of nominees and an occasional rejection of a recommendation of the Membership Committee could result in serious embarrassment to all parties concerned. This should be avoided whenever possible. It seems to me that the actual selection of nominees is a responsibility which has been quite properly delegated to the board of directors.

Mr. Locke: When I was a member of the Membership Committee, our discussions focused on this matter of quality, not quantity. It seems to me however, that quality is very difficult to measure and that, as a result, we often were quite vague as to the bases of any given nomination. I, therefore, support Mr. McAnally's motion because I feel it would result in a more open and valid consideration of new members.

Mr. Lundy (Nebraska): I should like to know why the roster of the Membership Committee is a secret?

Mr. McCarthy: The Membership Committee has not been publicized because it was felt that its members would be subjected to undue pressure and logrolling, which would make it difficult for the committee to arrive at objective recommendations.

Mr. Clapp: I wish to make clear that I am speaking as a guest. As I recall, in those days when the Association had about fifty members, the membership was reviewed from time to time by a reviewing committee known to everyone. The data about the members and those proposed for membership were assembled by the committee from information supplied by the libraries themselves. It was tabulated and distributed to every member. The data were arranged in a certain descending order, although there wasn't a complete uniformity among the data elements. The information, however, did give the membership a solid basis on which to vote.

Mr. Metcalf: At one time, it was possible to drop members because they did not meet certain specifications.

Mr. Haas: There has been a call for the question. I will repeat the motion. It is moved that in the future, the Membership Committee submit to the membership prior to the midwinter meeting the names of institutions proposed for membership, along with the pertinent data supporting the recommendations and that the nominated institutions should not be formally notified that they are being considered until membership action has been taken. Those in favor of the motion raise your hands. Those opposed? Let the record show that the motion carried.

Mr. Haas: Is there any other new business?

Mr. Locke: Mr. President, I move that the Membership Committee no longer be a secret committee, that its members be made known to the membership as are members of all other committees.

Mr. Haas: Is there a second to that motion? There is a second. The question has been called. Those in favor of the motion, which states that the names of the Membership Committee be made public, please raise your hands. Those opposed? Let the record show that the motion carried.

President's Report

Mr. Haas: Thanks to the excellent work of the executive director and the board, my report will be a short one.

First, the board agrees that in the future the officers of the Association will make it a practice at the beginning of each year to formally review the assignments of each ARL committee, to make certain that the charge of the committee is clear to both the board and the committee members. This means that the officers and board will monitor, with even more precision than in the past, the work of the committees. This is necessary because the very substantial amount of work that is done by this Association is done through its committees.

My second point is one about which I have talked to you before. The numerous and diverse activities of the Association, ranging from the subject of preservation to the feasibility of a national lending library, clearly indicate that the ARL must develop a new capability for collective action. The magnitude of the job to be done, if access to research materials is to be made wider and more effective, requires a capacity for action greater than we now have. I have no doubt that this new capacity will involve our energies in the years to come.

Let me conclude by saying that the ARL Washington office constitutes a most remarkable kind of operating capability. All of us are greatful to the immense amount of work done by Stephen McCarthy and his staff. We are indebted to them for their efforts.

At this point, I present Thomas Buckman, president of the Association for 1971.

Mr. Buckman: I should like to thank Mr. Haas on behalf of the Association for very capably and effectively carrying forward the affairs of the ARL during the past year.

After a long day of meetings, it may be a solace for you to know that one of the chief objectives of my presidency is to establish an ARL Rest and Rehabilitation Center for library directors. The first encampment will take place at Colorado Springs in May, during which time provision will be made for the Seventy-eighth Meeting of the Association. In the near future, reservation cards will be sent to the membership, along with a tentative program. The final program will be sent along as soon as all of the details are completed. We should have a most profitable and enjoyable meeting.

* * * * *

President Buckman adjourned the meeting at 6:00 p.m.

APPENDIX A

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO EXISTING BYLAWS
OF
THE ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

ARTICLE II--Membership:

Strike all of Section 2--Qualifications--and substitute the following:

Major university libraries are considered to be those: whose parent institutions broadly emphasize research and graduate instruction at the doctoral level and grant their own degrees; which support large, comprehensive research collections on a permanent basis; and which give evidence of an institutional capacity and commitment both to support the purposes of major research libraries and to aid in solving the problems characteristic of such libraries.

In evaluating potential university library members, the Board of Directors will give consideration to the following guidelines:

- the number of distinct disciplines in which the Ph.D. degree is offered;
- the number of Ph.D. degrees conferred;
- the amount spent for library materials and binding; and
- such other guidelines as the Board of Directors may deem desirable for purposes of evaluation.

APPENDIX B

BYLAWS

of

THE ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

ARTICLE I - Offices.

The principal office of the Association shall be located in the office of the Executive Director. The Association may have such other offices as the Board of Directors may determine, or as the affairs of the Association may require from time to time.

ARTICLE II - Membership.

Section 1 - Member Institutions:

Membership in the Association shall be on an institutional basis. Membership shall be open, on invitation of the Association, to major university libraries and to certain other libraries whose collections and services are similarly broadly based and are recognized as having national significance. Invitations to membership shall be issued at the initiative of the Board of Directors, subject to the approval of the membership.

Section 2 - Qualifications:

Major university libraries are considered to be those: whose parent institutions broadly emphasize research and graduate instruction at the doctoral level and grant their own degrees; which support large, comprehensive research collections on a permanent basis; and which give evidence of an institutional capacity and commitment both to support the purposes of major research libraries and to aid in solving the problems characteristic of such libraries.

In evaluating potential university library members, the Board of Directors will give consideration to the following guidelines:

- the number of distinct disciplines in which the Ph.D. degree is offered;
- the number of Ph.D. degrees conferred;
- the amount spent for library materials and binding; and
- such other guidelines as the Board of Directors may deem desirable for purposes of evaluation.

Section 3 - Transfer of Membership:

Membership in the Association is not transferable or assignable.

ARTICLE III - Board of Directors.

Section 1 - Board of Directors:

There shall be a Board of Directors which shall manage the affairs of the Association. The number of Directors shall be not less than nine nor more than twelve. The President, Vice-President, and Immediate Past President of the Association shall be members of the Board. Directors shall be elected for terms of three years, three to be elected annually as provided in Article IV. Each Director shall be chosen from among the chief librarians representing member institutions of the Association. Each Director shall take office at the close of the Annual Meeting at which he is elected and shall serve until the end of the Annual Meeting held at the close of his term of office. Notwithstanding any other provision contained in these Bylaws, an officer of the Association who is serving as a member of the Board of Directors may continue to serve as a member of the Board until the expiration of his term as officer despite the fact that his normal, three-year term as Director may have expired. Any vacancy arising in the Board of Directors shall be filled by the Board of Directors, the appointee to serve until the next Annual Meeting, when a successor for the unexpired term shall be nominated and elected by the members of the Association.

Section 2 - Quorum and Action:

A majority of the members of the Board of Directors shall constitute a quorum. Action by the Board of Directors shall be by majority vote of the Directors present except that, as provided in Article V, Section 4 of these Bylaws, election of the Vice-President shall be by the vote of an absolute majority of the total membership of the Board.

Section 3 - Notice of Meetings:

A regular meeting of the Board of Directors shall be held without other notice than this Bylaw, after the Annual Meeting of the Association, either on the same day thereof, or on the next succeeding day thereafter, at the time and place announced by the President at the Annual Meeting. The Board of Directors may provide by resolution the time and place for the holding of additional regular meetings of the Board of Directors without other notice than such resolution. Special meetings of the Board of Directors may be called by or at the request of the President or any two Directors. Notice of any special meeting of the Board of Directors shall be given at least ten days previously thereto by written notice delivered personally or sent by mail or telegram to each Director at his address as shown by the records of the Association. If mailed, such notice shall be deemed to be delivered when deposited in the United States mail in a sealed envelope so addressed, with postage thereon prepaid. If notice be given by telegram, such notice shall be deemed to be delivered when the telegram is delivered to the telegraph company. Notice of a meeting need not be given to any Director who signs a waiver of notice whether before or after the meeting, or who attends the meeting without protesting, prior thereto or at its commencement, the lack of notice to him. The business to be transacted at, and the purpose of, any special meeting of the Board of Directors shall be specified in the notice or waiver of notice of such meeting.

ARTICLE IV - Nominations and Elections of the Board of Directors.

Section 1 - Nominating Committee:

There shall be a nominating committee of three persons one to be the Vice-President who shall serve as chairman of the Nominating Committee; and two persons to be appointed annually by the President of the Association.

Section 2 - Nominations:

It shall be the duty of the Nominating Committee to select annually a slate of five nominees for the Board of Directors. No Director, having served a full three-year term, may be nominated to succeed himself. The consent of the candidates to serve if elected must be obtained before nominations are accepted. The report of the nominating committee shall be distributed to the members at least thirty days before the election.

Additional nominations may be made from the floor.

Section 3 - Elections of the Board:

Each member may vote for not more than three nominees, except for the election of a successor for an unexpired term.

The three candidates receiving the highest number of votes shall become members of the Board for three-year terms.

ARTICLE V - Officers.

Section 1 - Officers:

The officers of the Association shall be a President, a Vice-President, an Immediate Past President, and an Executive Director. The officers, except the Executive Director, shall serve for terms of one year each. The Vice-President shall automatically succeed to the Presidency at the end of his term as Vice-President. The President shall preside at meetings of the Association and of the Board of Directors. The President shall perform all duties incident to his office and such other duties as may be prescribed by the Board of Directors. In the absence of the President or in event of his inability or refusal to act, the Vice-President shall perform the duties of the President and when so acting, shall have all the powers of and be subject to all the restrictions upon the President. The Vice-President shall perform such other duties as from time to time may be assigned to him by the President or by the Board of Directors. The officers shall have and may exercise all the powers of the Board of Directors between meetings of the Board, when necessary. Their action shall be subject to subsequent ratification by the Board of Directors.

Section 2 - Executive Director:

There shall be an Executive Director of the Association, appointed by the Board of Directors, who shall serve at its pleasure. The Executive Director shall serve as Director of the Association but shall not be a member of the Board of Directors. He shall also serve as Treasurer of the Association and shall be bonded.

Section 3 - Duties of the Executive Director:

The Executive Director shall be in charge of the principal office of the Association and its personnel; he shall conduct the Association's administrative affairs; he shall be responsible for the execution of all orders of the Board of Directors; he shall prepare an annual budget and carry out the activities provided for in the budget as adopted by the Board of Directors; he shall have charge and custody of and be responsible for all funds and securities of the Association; he shall receive and give receipts for moneys due and payable to the Association from any source whatsoever and deposit all such moneys in the name of the Association in such depositories as shall be selected by the Board of Directors; he shall see that all notices are duly given in accordance with these Bylaws or as required by law; he shall keep a register of the post office address of each member which shall be furnished to the Executive Director by such member; he shall keep all minutes, and issue minutes and reports as required by the Board of Directors; he shall perform such other duties as from time to time may be assigned to him by the Board of Directors.

Section 4 - Vice-President:

The Vice-President shall be chosen from among members of the Board of Directors. Notwithstanding Article III, Section 2 of these Bylaws, he shall be elected by the vote of an absolute majority of the total membership of the Board. In the event that no one candidate for Vice-President receives an absolute majority in the first election, there shall be a run-off election between the two candidates receiving the highest number of votes, and that candidate receiving a majority in the run-off election shall be elected Vice-President. In the event the run-off election results in a tie, additional elections shall be conducted until one candidate receives a majority.

ARTICLE VI - Meetings.

Section 1 - Annual and Special Meetings:

There shall be an Annual Meeting of the Association at a time and place to be determined by the Board of Directors. The Association may meet at such other times and places as may be determined by the Board of Directors.

Section 2 - Notice of Meetings:

Written or printed notice stating the place, day and hour of any meeting of the Association shall be delivered, either personally or by mail, to each member entitled to vote at such meeting, not less than ten nor more than fifty days before the date of such meeting, except as otherwise required by law or by these Bylaws, by or at the direction of the Board of Directors, the President or the Executive Director. When a meeting is adjourned to another time or place, it shall not be necessary to give any notice of the adjourned meeting if the time and place to which the meeting is adjourned are announced at the meeting at which the adjournment is taken, and at the adjourned meeting any business which might have been transacted on the original date of the meeting may be transacted. In case of a special meeting or when required by law or by these Bylaws, the purpose or purposes for which the meeting is called shall be stated in the notice. If mailed, the notice of a meeting shall be deemed delivered when deposited in the United States mail addressed to the member at its address as it appears on the register of members, with postage thereon prepaid.

Section 3 - Quorum and Action:

A majority of the total membership shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, and an affirmative vote of a majority of the members voting, but not less than one-third of the total membership, shall be sufficient except as otherwise required by law or by these Bylaws.

Section 4 - Voting:

Each member shall be entitled to one vote on each matter submitted to a vote of the members. A member shall be represented in proxy by its chief librarian, or in his absence, by its associate or one of its assistant librarians. Voting may be by proxy or by mail or by a combination thereof.

Section 5 - Parliamentary Procedures:

The conduct of meetings shall follow Robert's Rules of Order.

ARTICLE VII - Committees.

In addition to the Nominating Committee, such other standing and *ad hoc* committee as may be needed to carry out the business of the Association may be appointed by the Board of Directors.

ARTICLE VIII - Dues .

Section 1 - Fixing of Dues:

Membership dues shall be proposed by the Board of Directors and shall require approval by an affirmative vote of a majority of the total membership of the Association after due notice.

Section 2 - Forfeiture of Membership for Failure to Pay Dues:

A member failing to pay dues for two successive years shall automatically forfeit membership in the Association.

ARTICLE IX - Contracts, Checks, Deposits and Funds.

Section 1 - Contracts:

The Board of Directors may authorize any officer or officers, agent or agents of the Association, in addition to the officers so authorized by these Bylaws, to enter into any contract or execute and deliver any instrument in the name of and on behalf of the Association and such authority may be general or confined to specific instances.

Section 2 - Checks, Drafts, etc:

All checks, drafts or orders for the payment of money, notes or other evidences of indebtedness issued in the name of the Association, shall be signed by such officer or officers, agent or agents of the Association and in such manner as shall from time to time be determined by resolution of the Board of Directors. In the absence of such determination by the Board of Directors, such instruments shall be signed by the Executive Director and counter-signed by the President or Vice-President.

Section 3 - Deposits:

All funds of the Association shall be deposited from time to time to the credit of the Association in such depositories as the Board of Directors may select.

Section 4 - Gifts:

The Board of Directors may accept on behalf of the Association any grant, contribution, gift, bequest or device for the general purposes or for any special purpose of the Association.

ARTICLE X - Books and Records.

The Association shall keep correct and complete books and records of account and shall also keep minutes of the proceedings of its members, Board of Directors and committees having any of the authority of the Board of Directors, and shall keep at the principal office a register giving the names and addresses of the members entitled to vote. All books and records of the Association may be inspected by any member, or his agent or attorney for any proper purpose at any reasonable time.

ARTICLE XI - Fiscal Year.

The fiscal year of the Association shall be the calendar year.

ARTICLE XII - Waiver of Notice.

Notice of meeting need not be given to any member who signs a waiver of notice, whether before or after the meeting. The attendance of or voting by any member at a meeting, without protesting, prior thereto or at its commencement, the lack of notice of such meeting, shall constitute a waiver of notice by such member.

ARTICLE XIII - Amendments.

Amendment of these Bylaws requires an affirmative vote of a majority of the total membership of the Association, at any meeting of the Association, provided that notice of such meeting and the proposed amendment has been given in writing at least thirty days in advance of the meeting by the Executive Director with the approval of the Board of Directors.

ARTICLE XIV - Dissolution.

Upon dissolution of the Association, the assets of the Association shall be applied and distributed as follows:

a. All liabilities and obligations of the Association shall be paid, satisfied, and discharged, or adequate provision shall be made therefor;

b. Assets held by the Association upon condition requiring return, transfer, or conveyance, which condition occurs by reason of the dissolution, shall be returned, transferred, or conveyed in accordance with such requirements;

c. Assets received and held by the Association subject to limitations permitting their use only for literary, educational, scientific, or similar purposes, but not held upon a condition requiring return, transfer, or conveyance by reason of the dissolution, shall be transferred or conveyed to one or more organizations exempt from income tax as organizations described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code having as and pursuing purposes substantially similar to those of the Association, pursuant to a duly adopted plan of distribution;

d. Any remaining assets shall be distributed to one or more organizations exempt from income tax as organizations described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code for any one or more literary, educational, or scientific purpose or purposes, or to the federal government, or to a state or local government, for a public purpose, pursuant to a duly adopted plan of distribution, or by a court to one or more such organizations to be used in such manner as in the judgment of the court will best accomplish the purposes for which the Association was organized.

Adopted January 28-29, 1962.

Amended June 22, 1968.

Amended January 17, 1971.

APPENDIX C

REPORT OF THE CENTER FOR CHINESE RESEARCH MATERIALS

At the end of October 1970, after two and one-half years of operation, the ARL Chinese Center has made available 265 items of Chinese research materials to libraries and researchers in the United States and abroad. Of these, 104 items, more than 39 percent of the total, have been made available during 1970. At the end of September 1970, sales of the Center's materials to 63 American libraries and 7 Canadian institutions amounted to $63,589.76 and $3,366.90 respectively. Total sales, including items purchased by libraries and individuals abroad, came to $94,278.46.

The *Quarterly Review of Social Sciences* (Nanking, 1930-1948), 5,000 pages in length, was the largest reprint in book form. On film the Center has made available a set of 103 reels of *Shen Pao*, 1923-1949 (known as the *New York Times* of China), and 107 reels of *Chinese Maritime Customs Publications*, originally published from 1861 to 1948. Regardless of whether the original publication is in Chinese or English, in bound volumes or on film, it is always bibliographically identified in English.

Although reproduction programs have always taken first place in the Center's activities, a number of research aids, such as the following, have been compiled and published.

1. *Chinese Microfilms in Princeton University: A Checklist of the Gest Oriental Library*.
2. *History of Communications: A Grand Table of Contents*.
3. *The Red Flag (Hung ch'i), 1958-1968: A Research Guide*.
4. *The Revolutionary Movement During the Late Ch'ing: A Guide to Chinese Periodicals*.
5. *Red Guard Publications (RG-9): A Checklist*.

Two important and rare bibliographies which were not compiled at the Center but were reproduced by it on film are:

1. *National Bibliography*. Peking, 1951-1966, 9 reels;
2. *Cumulative Bibliography* (for the years 1949-1956). Peking, 1956-1957, 4 reels.

The staff of the Chinese Center has interviewed personnel in federal agencies which engage in research on China. The Center has found that many librarians and researchers in the Chinese field are not acquainted with much of the work done by these agencies and the many publications put out by them.

For this reason, the Center has collected such information on the following agencies and published it in its Newsletter.

1. Office of External Research, U.S. Department of State;
2. National Technical Information Service (formerly Clearinghouse for Federal Scientific and Technical Information), U.S. Department of Commerce;
3. Joint Publications Research Service, U.S. Department of Commerce;
4. Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce;
5. National Agricultural Library, U.S. Department of Agriculture;
6. Orientalia Division, Library of Congress;
7. U.S. National Archives.

Up to December 1970, 6 issues of the Newsletter were published and distributed free of charge to 1,000 readers in the U.S. and 500 readers abroad. The Newsletter, in addition to giving information such as that mentioned above, serves to announce the availability of the Center's publications. Questionnaires have been included in some of the issues to elicit suggestions and comments from the readers.

The reproduction programs of the ARL Chinese Center not only supply research libraries with more materials, but also contribute to the efforts currently under way to preserve deteriorating Chinese materials in American research libraries. A case in point is the Banker's Weekly, a Chinese periodical published from 1917 to 1950. Originals of this important periodical were found to be in a brittle condition. The Center is currently reproducing it, with the microfilming being done at Columbia University Libraries through the cooperation of its director, Mr. Warren J. Haas. When completed, the set will be in some 60 reels of film.

The full-time staff of the Center includes the director, two bibliographers and one secretary. In the fall of 1969, because of an increase in the work load, the Center added two part-time clerical assistants. The director of the Center is fortunate in having a staff that is capable, devoted and conscientious.

During the past year, the Center has again made extensive use of the loan privileges extended by American research libraries. In the final analysis, they deserve the credit for having made the ARL Chinese Center a successful operation.

P.K. Yu

December 15, 1970

APPENDIX D

REPORT OF THE NATIONAL SERIALS PILOT PROJECT

The project is going forward, utilizing the MARC internal serials format. In a sense, it has become a field test for this format. Input is into a computer at the Library of Congress via remote typewriter terminals, and the data is processed by a computer at the National Library of Medicine.

The project now has a full set of operational programs, and reformatting to the ATS output format has been done for *Index Medicus* titles and non-*Index Medicus* titles in the *Union Catalog of Medical Periodicals* format and the *Union List of Scientific Serials in Canadian Libraries*, Third Edition. Work is going forward at the National Agricultural Library that is expected to result in the re-creation of its CAIN file in the ATS output format.

The funds initially provided by the National Agricultural Library have been exhausted, but the project will be continued through June 30, 1971, with funds made available by the Council on Library Resources, the Library of Congress, the National Agricultural Library and the National Library of Medicine.

In a very real sense the pilot aspect of the operations has been completed, and it would be more accurate to describe present operations as demonstration rather than pilot.

The staff has been increased to permit input via two terminals, with a corresponding increase in the number of editors employed in the preparation of data for input. In addition, a full-time programmer has been added to the staff, which now numbers eight people, including the director.

The project has experimented with the use of Standard Serial Numbers. These efforts have been successful, and it would be possible to use the project file as an initial SSN file.

The principal activities now are the preparation of certain documents and file-building. By June 30, 1971, each of the three national libraries should have the following:

1. One tape file, in the MARC serials internal format containing 12,000 to 14,000 verified and edited titles (with holdings of the Library of Congress, the National Agricultural Library and the National Library of Medicine, as provided to the project by the national libraries) in the fields of science and technology. These titles will be obtained from the following sources.

a) Union List of Scientific Serials in Canadian Libraries, Third Edition;

b) Index Medicus titles received in the format of the Union Catalog of Medical Periodicals;

c) Titles supplied by the National Agricultural Library.

2. One printout, in control number sequence, of the contents of the above tape file.

3. Documentation of systems used by the National Serials Pilot Project, such documentation to include:

    a) systems flowcharts and descriptions;

    b) program flowcharts and descriptions;

    c) linkage mechanisms between programs;

    d) input format layouts;

    e) file and record layouts, including both tape and disk files;

    f) output descriptions;

    g) logical restart procedures and sequences.

4. Source decks for all programs used by the National Serials Pilot Project.

5. Printouts of all programs used by the National Serials Pilot Project.

6. Manuals of National Serials Pilot Project procedures, including procedures in verification, MARC editing and input, and the forms used for input.

7. A tape file of the reformatted Union List of Scientific Serials in Canadian Libraries, Third Edition, containing 36,696 records.

8. A tape file of the unreformatted Union List of Scientific Serials in Canadian Libraries, Third Edition.

9. A printout of the reformatted Union List of Scientific Serials in Canadian Libraries, Third Edition, containing 36,696 records.

10. A tape file of the 2,243 Index Medicus titles input to the Union Catalog of Medical Periodicals as reformatted.

APPENDIX D

11. A printout of the reformatted 2,243 Index Medicus titles via Union Catalog of Medical Periodicals.

12. A tape file of the 2,181 National Library of Medicine titles (non-Index Medicus) reformatted from the Union Catalog of Medical Periodicals.

13. A printout of the 2,181 National Library of Medicine non-Index Medicus titles from the tape file.

14. A written report summarizing what has been done by the National Serials Pilot Project and what remains to be done.

Donald W. Johnson

December 31, 1970

APPENDIX E

REPORT OF THE OFFICE OF UNIVERSITY LIBRARY MANAGEMENT STUDIES

The Office of University Library Management Studies was established within the Association of Research Libraries on October 1, 1970. Funded by the Council on Library Resources and co-sponsored by the American Council on Education, it reflects a growing ARL commitment to provide as much assistance as possible to improve the management of university and other research libraries. In the past, expressions of this commitment have included papers presented at meetings of the Association, general discussions among directors of ARL libraries, and sponsorship of the investigation that produced the report, Problems in University Library Management. This report itemized and explained in detail issues of concern to research library administration in the areas of planning, financing, organization, staffing, interinstitutional cooperation, objectives and operations. It recommended research programs which would focus on these problems and provide practical solutions.

The Association, acting on the recommendations of this report, is sponsoring a study of the organization and staffing of the Columbia University Libraries. Booz, Allen & Hamilton, a management consultant firm, is the principal investigator for this study which is funded by the Council on Library Resources. The ARL/ACE Committee on University Library Management will provide guidance for the study and will evaluate findings and conclusions.

The director of the Office of University Library Management Studies is participating in the project as a member of the consulting team. This participation is designed to gain for the office an understanding of management consulting techniques and activities, to bring a professional librarian's viewpoint to a management oriented consulting team, and to provide liaison among Columbia, the consultants and the ARL.

The Columbia study will take nine to twelve months and produce two major products. First will be a case study report which examines the organization and staffing of the Columbia University Libraries in the light of current and anticipated requirements. Alternative patterns of organization and staffing will be evaluated on the basis of their success in meeting the requirements of users, staff, and the university administration.

Secondly, recommendations will be prepared for specific activities that the Management Studies Office should pursue on a continuing basis. These could include research into other management problems, conducting conferences or training seminars, acting as a management information clearinghouse and providing consulting services.

Current progress on the Columbia study is encouraging. An initial meeting was held November 6 at Columbia with representatives of the ARL, Booz, Allen & Hamilton, the Council on Library Resources, Columbia University

Libraries and the Columbia University administration. The background, scope and objectives of the study were reviewed during this meeting. Following this general discussion, the consulting team met with a steering committee, composed of staff members of the Columbia University Libraries, to obtain their assistance in refining the general objectives and determining critical issues. Subsequent activities have covered development of a work plan, outlining methodology and work schedule, completion of survey tools for interviews with key library administrators and university officials, review of available documentation on library policies and procedures, preparation of questionnaires on personnel data and staff attitudes, and analysis of the characteristics of the present major units of organization. It is expected that the ARL/ACE Committee will review the progress of the study at an early date.

Duane Webster

December 30, 1970

APPENDIX F

REPORT OF THE SLAVIC BIBLIOGRAPHIC AND DOCUMENTATION CENTER

The end of the first full year of the Slavic Center's operation is a proper time to take a look at what has been accomplished and particularly to offer some comments on our experiences in trying to implement some of the projects which were suggested in the proposal to establish the Center.

The publication of a monthly guide to the selection and acquisition of current Slavic titles in the social sciences and humanities was considered to be of prime importance. In addition to the 3 sample issues, which were distributed to over 1300 libraries and scholars during the late spring and early summer, 4 numbers of volume 2 of New Slavic Publications have been sent to subscribers since September. Subscriptions have been coming in slowly at the rate of 4 or 5 a week for several months, but now--having just reached 100--have almost stopped. We will probably receive a few more, but it seems unlikely that the number will increase significantly above the current level. This selection tool is intended primarily for smaller libraries without Slavic bibliographers; yet less than half of the subscriptions have come from that category of libraries. The larger libraries among NSP subscribers--including about 35 ARL members--apparently use it for other than selection purposes. The rest are individual scholars and, interestingly enough, several British university libraries.

Unawareness of the existence of NSP cannot be blamed for the relatively small number of subscriptions. Besides mailing ca. 3000 sample copies, we advertised in several journals, had announcements in others and called attention to it in our own Newsletter. Perhaps our expectations of several hundred subscriptions were unrealistic when one considers that there are only about 250 universities and colleges in this country which offer programs leading to a B.A. degree in Russian language and literature at one end of the scale, and Ph.D.'s in several fields at the other. Another reason is undoubtedly the cutback in financial support for higher education in general, and area studies programs in particular. If there are serious criticisms as to scope, language coverage, etc., which might limit the usefulness of NSP to a given library, we have not received them directly, despite the fact that we encouraged subscribers to make suggestions. We plan to add a brief questionnaire in the next number to ask again for opinions on how we can improve this publication; hopefully we shall have more success.

Without wishing to sound overly pessimistic, the small subscriber group suggests perhaps that a selection tool such as NSP is not the urgent requirement it was thought to be about 3 years ago. If the next few months show that this is indeed the case, serious consideration should be given to the abandonment of this project.

APPENDIX F

A second activity--although not considered at first to be one of priority--has caught on much more immediately. This is the compilation of a list of dissertations in progress. After the initial mailing of information cards to the appropriate departments of U.S. and Canadian universities, a large number of requests for additional cards were received by the Center. As of the end of December, ca. 240 dissertation titles have been received and we are now preparing the first annual issue. Its usefulness will be further enhanced by the fact that ca. 200 dissertations in history in progress at West German universities will be included as well.

The degree of cooperation and the large number of favorable comments which we have received in regard to this project seem to indicate its desirability.

Another real achievement has been the recent publication of *Research Materials for Slavists: U.S. Government Sources*, a report by Anita Navon, which is part of our attempt to identify and control "fugitive" materials. As far as we know, this survey brings together for the first time much useful information about government agencies which publish research in the social sciences of interest to Slavic scholars.

In October, the Center issued the second number of its Newsletter, which consisted of 8 pages and contained a number of items of great interest and importance to the Slavic scholarly and library community. Its mailing list numbers over 2700 and we hope to issue it on a quarterly basis from now on, including regular sections on new bibliographies, periodicals and series, bibliographies, research in progress, etc.

There are several other projects at various stages of planning and completion, e.g., a list of book dealers, and a checklist of indexes to Slavic periodicals. The next report will have more to say about them.

The last vacancy on our staff was filled by Mr. William Putnam, who started work in September. The Center is at last at full strength and can look forward with confidence to a fruitful 1971. Whatever success we had in the difficult year just past is in no small measure due to the devotion and spirit of cooperation on the part of my co-workers.

E. Alex Baer

December 22, 1970

APPENDIX G

REPORT OF THE ARL AD HOC COMMITTEE ON SPECIFICATIONS FOR A STUDY OF AUTOMATION IN RESEARCH LIBRARIES*

For several years the members of the ARL, collectively and individually, have been increasingly concerned about the orderly development of computer applications to the operation of research libraries.

Within individual institutions many projects have been undertaken on a piecemeal basis, sometimes for valid reasons and sometimes as a result of institutional pressures based on unrealistic expectations. Emphasis on the early production of visible results, as the criterion of success, has usually tended to limit these projects to the mechanization of particular housekeeping tasks, and has tended to discourage work on the large basic pro-problems. In effect, each institution is building its own locomotive, using local designs and standards and whatever tools are at hand, and hoping that its engine will fit somehow into an effective transcontinental railroad system when one is designed.

From the national point of view, the ARL and other agencies have sought ways to arrive at a general pattern within which orderly development could take place, but have not been successful. It becomes increasingly clear that the library community needs a rational definition of objectives, and a national strategy for attaining them.

We think the "review of automation" for which we are to prepare specifications should be a "position paper" concerned with the future course of computer-based data processing in large research libraries, especially the university libraries which are members of the ARL. While it must take current operations and problems into account, and should not ignore the more distant future, it should not be a projection of current efforts or a forecast of technical capabilities. It should define goals in terms of library functions, examine the practical constraints, and propose priorities for the next five years. We suggest five years as a planning period for which developments can be imagined if not foreseen, and within which practical progress may be made.

We do not suppose that such a position paper would be taken as the ultimate word on its subject, or that it should have any prescriptive or proscriptive authority, but we do think it could be extremely useful as a statement of informed opinion, a thoughtful and consistent approach to some confused and difficult matters. It could provide guidelines for institutions and for granting agencies, and a rational strategy for the attacks that have to be made on major problems. It could be a means of enlightening

---

*[This report was inadvertantly omitted from the *Minutes of the Seventy-Sixth Meeting*.]

legislators and university boards concerning the reality of these problems. It should help to increase the overall rate of progress, reduce the amount of wasteful duplication in local efforts, and help to avoid a variety of local divergencies which could grow into long-term incompatibilities.

Obviously the position paper cannot be written by a volunteer committee. Ideally it should be done by a seasoned philosopher thoroughly versed in the needs of scholars, the theory and practice of bibliography, the design and application of computers, and the management of research libraries. Since the only people we know with all these qualifications are otherwise engaged, and since there is real urgency for the job to be done, we suggest that it should be done by a team of two or three wise people with the best possible combination of these qualifications, each devoting perhaps two to ten months of his time to it. In this way, it might be possible to have the result ready for presentation to the ARL in January 1971. We think the matter is so important that the ARL should spare no effort in enlisting the best people for it. They should, of course, receive appropriate compensation, and the means to do whatever travelling and consulting they deem necessary. In the course of their work, they may have to call upon ARL institutions to provide data and staff consultation time, up to several days in some cases.

The position paper, when completed, should be reviewed by a small ARL committee, which would recommend to the board concerning its publication or other use. The paper should not be shaped or limited by the following outline, but should deal in some way with each of the matters indicated.

A NATIONAL STRATEGY FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF COMPUTER APPLICATIONS TO THE FUNCTIONS OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES, 1971-76.

I. Objectives

It should be clear from the beginning that we are concerned with finding the most effective ways of carrying out essential functions, not with expediting the mechanization of existing operations nor with discovering uses for a new technology. The paper should take account of the fact that changing technology may offer new and better ways of performing functions, better approaches to bibliographic structure, and that the door should be left open for such innovations. There should be:

A. An assessment of those library functions and bibliographic substructures which could benefit from and are now susceptible of computer-based data processing; also a ranking of these things by functional importance, and by potential impact;

B. An assessment of those functions which seem as though they could not benefit or are not ready;

C. An assessment of the importance of developments in certain of these areas being made compatible with similar developments in other countries;

D. An assessment of the extent to which access to the rapidly growing number of mechanized "data banks" and discipline-oriented data bases, which at present are all mutually incompatible, should be considered in plans for library automation;

E. A statement of the expectations of library users in terms of access to text, and in terms of ease and immediacy and frequency and depth of access to the bibliographic record;

F. In all the points above, an indication of similarities and differences between the institutional and the national point of view.

II. Constraints

The paper should indicate what is technically feasible, what magnitude of costs can be expected locally and in a national system, and what is likely to be practical in the light of cost-benefit.

A. In terms of the objectives outlined in Section 1 above, what are the technical limitations and other impediments, and to what extent are these likely to change in the next five years?

B. How much is actually known about the practical management of mechanized files of data having the bulk and complexity implied in Section I? What are the practical limits now, in complexity and response time? What technical improvements are needed, and are they being developed by research outside the bibliographic field?

C. To what extent do the limitations of present input/output equipment fall within the practical tolerance of readers and library staff? What improvements are needed, and are they being developed outside the library field?

D. What are the program-language requirements of various library applications?

E. How much is known about the transfer of data and programs from one application, or one library, to another? Why is it so difficult? What measures could be taken to make it easier? Would the benefits of easy transfer be offset by losses of efficiency in machine utilization? What is the prospect of general purpose data-management systems?

F. What are the practical realities of the "total systems" approach, which implies development based on a comprehensive pre-definition of operations?

G. To what extent is a single data base practical within a local library, or among a group of libraries?

H. What are the dangers of local and piecemeal development in terms of useful compatibility?

I. What are the relative technical and economic advantages of library-dedicated equipment, shared equipment within a university, equipment shared among libraries? What is the effect of equipment changes in a shared operation?

J. Technically, what approaches are there to retrospective conversion of records? In view of the existing manual systems which must continue to function during the conversion period, what approaches are most practical locally and nationally?

K. What cost estimates can be made to guide planning and how can the economics best be determined?

L. Assuming that there may be money available for development and conversion, what will be the magnitude of the continuing costs of operation, and what may libraries be able to support, individually and collectively?

M. How should standards for bibliographic data, among producing agencies, be established and maintained nationally and internationally?

N. For purposes of development and operation, what manpower is implied and to what extent is it available, or how and over what period of time can it be developed?

O. What is a practical timetable? Given the complexity of the tasks which could or might be done, assuming that machines and money and staff were all available, what would be a reasonable rate of development? How much could we hope to accomplish in five years?

III. Priorities

A. Given the relative importance of the objectives, and the present capabilities of equipment and the time required, what should be the national priorities up to 1976?

B. Given the present pattern and level of outside funding, and the financial prospects in libraries across the continent, how much can we expect to accomplish?

C. What would be the advantages of having outside funds directed to the solution of particular problems, and only to a few libraries, or to two or three research institutes? Would the ARL libraries receive the benefits of automation sooner if they shared the cost of research and development in just a few places, or if most libraries simply suspended their own projects which are not yet operational? Or is it more profitable for them to carry on local, piecemeal attacks on problems which are of local interest?

D. If a few libraries or other agencies should do the pioneer work:

1. How should they be chosen?
2. What problems should they tackle, and in what order?
3. What divisions of work should there be, without leaving gaps and without there being undue overlapping?
4. How much duplication of tasks is desirable to ensure varied and innovative approaches to each problem?
5. How should their work be coordinated?
6. How should they handle consultation on common problems?
7. How should their work relate to the national libraries?
8. How and where should their work be observed and reported and reviewed, without subjecting them to an unnecessary and harmful burden of inquisitors, hitchhikers, and tourists?

Robert Blackburn, chairman
Herman Fussler
Rutherford Rogers

June 5, 1970

2

APPENDIX H

REPORT OF THE FEDERAL RELATIONS COMMITTEE

As of the end of the 91st session of Congress, the Federal Relations Committee faces as many questions and uncertainties as does the membership at large. The main uncertainties, of course, relate to potential higher education legislation and the status of the authorized, but as yet not appointed, National Commission. We have explored several avenues, but they are not well lighted as yet.

Under the circumstances we can only prepare ourselves for action when it may become useful to act.

Toward this end, we have asked Neal Harlow to draft a proposed guideline for federal support of research libraries. He will meet with the committee at midwinter and hopes to have a statement ready for general consideration at the spring meeting.

We also are convinced that the officers and staff of the ARL need more assured mechanisms for seeking membership assistance and advice when matters in Washington so require. We had asked Carl Jackson to begin discussion of this matter at Detroit. In light of the change of scenario and personalities in Washington, as well as in the ARL membership, we need to be somewhat more formal about these matters than in the past, while still recognizing the sensitivities involved.

The committee therefore seeks your specific help on two matters:

(1) May we, and Mr. McCarthy, count on your thoughtful and rapid response to any calls from the ARL for help on legislative matters, including, of course, appropriate telegrams or letters of support;

(2) Please let Mr. McCarthy know if you are willing and able on occasion to act as a pipeline to federal officers or Congressmen (or their staffs), either personally or by calling on some influential person you may have confidence in. Any information, specific or general, that you can provide to headquarters will be most useful and will be used with discretion. Please write Mr. McCarthy directly.

Robert Vosper

December 31, 1970

APPENDIX I

REPORT OF THE FOREIGN NEWSPAPER MICROFILM COMMITTEE

Norman Shaffer presented his report, "Study to Develop Recommendations for a National Foreign Newspaper Microfilm Program," at the committee's meeting on June 30, 1970. (Copies of the report were later distributed to the ARL membership for information.) It was felt that the Center for Research Libraries could expand coverage, as recommended in the report, to include newspapers from more countries, at least to a limited extent, without an increase in the subscription rate. Gordon Williams was asked to correspond with subscribers about expanded coverage, indicating that a given number of titles can be added with the surplus presently available at the CRL and asking whether they would be interested in even further expansion with resultant higher subscription rates.

The Library of Congress has followed through on its interest in establishing the office recommended in the report, which will facilitate and coordinate the selection and filming of foreign newspapers. Such a proposal is included in the 1972 budget request of the Library. Since these funds, if appropriated, would not be available until after July 1971, the Library made a proposal to the Council on Library Resources, endorsed by the ARL board at its October 1970 meeting, for financial support to establish the office prior to fiscal 1972. In a letter following the meeting of the board of the Council, at which the proposal was discussed, Fred Cole indicated that the decision not to support the request was arrived at reluctantly. They were hopeful that the project would be carried forward by the Library of Congress.

John G. Lorenz

December 8, 1970

APPENDIX J

REPORT OF THE INTERLIBRARY LOAN STUDY COMMITTEE

This committee was established in 1969 to explore the problem of interlibrary loans, particularly costs, to develop a proposal for a cost study, and to advise on conduct of the study if funding could be secured.

A proposal was developed and a grant secured in the summer of 1970 from the National Science Foundation, through efforts of the executive director of the ARL.

While the committee was concerned with all aspects of the interlibrary loan problem, it was decided to give first priority to a cost study, limited primarily to costs in research libraries. Data also will be secured on the magnitude of the problem at the national level, and on characteristics of the activity. Other aspects, such as application to other types of libraries and possible solutions to the national problem, might be covered in a subsequent study or studies. The latter were mentioned in the proposal as possible future investigations.

The firm of Westat, Inc., Washington, D. C., was chosen to conduct the study. The committee met with officers of the company and the executive director several times. Westat, Inc., has secured by random sampling a list of twelve large research libraries from which full data will be sought. Data on the magnitude and characteristics of interlibrary loans will be gathered from an additional sample of sixty-eight libraries. Procedures have been developed and approved. Data collection will be made in the early part of 1971.

Sarah K. Thompson was added to the committee after funding was secured. Her doctoral dissertation was on interlibrary loans, and she is chairman of the ALA RSD Interlibrary Loans Committee.

It is highly desirable that ARL members whose libraries happen to have been chosen cooperate fully. The task for the twelve basic libraries will be heavy. However, the findings should prove beneficial to all members and provide basic data for possible changes in the national interlibrary loan system.

Arthur McAnally

December 31, 1970

APPENDIX K

REPORT OF THE ARL/ACE COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY LIBRARY MANAGEMENT

The first phase of the Management Study was completed with the distribution in October of the report, Problems in University Library Management. The four university officers representing the American Council on Education and the five librarians representing the ARL, who together constitute the membership of the committee, have agreed to participate in succeeding phases of the study.

The ARL Office of University Library Management Studies has been established and Duane Webster, who heads the Office, has prepared a brief report for distribution to the membership.

A study of the organization and staffing of a large research library, two of the topics identified in the initial report, is under way at Columbia. It is hoped that this investigation will provide additional insights into a number of related management problems. Among the specifications against which the recommendations growing out of the Columbia study will be judged are these:

1. Because the end objective of university libraries is educational, a successful administrative organization must stimulate educational productivity and increase the educational impact of library operations.
2. The "system" must be responsive to the current research and educational requirements of all groups within the University.
3. Any acceptable plan of organization must enhance the role of librarians as active members of the educational community and as full participants in developing and implementing library programs.
4. The organizational structure should provide a capability for monitoring operations and service performance on a continuing basis.
5. The organizational plan should promote efficient use of human, financial, collection, and physical resources.
6. The organizational structure should promote and stimulate potentially meaningful experimentation and innovation.
7. The form of organization should promote development of a substantial capability for expanded interinstitutional operations and arrangements.

8. The specifications for staffing must aim not only at qualitative and quantitative descriptions of the range of skills and abilities required, but they must also promote the concept that each staff member must be able to fully use his abilities in his work.

The Columbia study, as the initial study effort of the ARL Office, is funded by the Council on Library Resources.

It is anticipated that, in one way or another, work will be done on other major topics central to the university library management process during the period ahead, with the ARL Office playing a leading role in both promoting the work and making the results available.

Warren J. Haas

January 7, 1971

APPENDIX L

REPORT OF THE ARL/ACRL JOINT COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY LIBRARY STANDARDS

The committee met in Washington, D. C. on October 17 to consider next steps in its efforts to develop a statement of standards for university libraries.

The committee agreed that a basis for further progress would be provided by a detailed analysis of previous attempts to establish standards, e.g., the California and Washington State formulas, the Canadian Association of College and University Libraries' Guide to University Library Standards, the Clapp-Jordan formula, USOE standards, and, of course, the committee's own report, University Library Statistics. This analysis is in process.

It was further agreed that four major aspects of university libraries should be considered in setting up standards: 1) collections, 2) personnel, 3) space, and 4) finances. The committee recognizes the fact that no single statement of standards can reasonably be applicable to all libraries. It proposes, therefore, at least tentatively, to think in terms of four groups of institutions:

1. University libraries (10 to 15), whose size and national significance justify applying special criteria;
2. Large university libraries--"large" judged in terms of size of collections and number of students and faculty served;
3. Medium size universities;
4. Small universities.

A definition of "university" would be desirable for the committee's purposes, but the difficulties in arriving at an acceptable definition are obvious. In any event, the committee's work will be confined to general, comprehensive institutions. omitting specialized institutions of limited scope. Within the total university, however, consideration will be given to standards for professional school libraries: law, medicine, agriculture, engineering, etc., taking into account, as far as they exist, criteria established by professional accrediting associations.

The committee expects to present a preliminary statement of standards for discussion at the ARL meeting in Colorado Springs in May.

Robert B. Downs

December 1, 1970

APPENDIX M

REPORT OF THE ARL REPRESENTATIVE TO THE AMERICAN NATIONAL STANDARDS INSTITUTE STANDARDS COMMITTEE Z39

Calendar year 1970 was a productive year for Standards Committee Z39. Three organizations, the American Society of Indexers, the R. R. Bowker Company and the Shoe String Press, became new members of Z39, bringing the total membership to forty-six. The committee held two meetings, one on May 12th and one on November 23rd, both in Washington, D. C. Twenty subcommittees continued their work on standards in various stages of development.

One standard, the American National Standard for the Abbreviation of Titles of Periodicals, revised and approved in 1969, was published by the Institute; and at the end of the year, the ANS for Bibliographic Information Interchange on Magnetic Tape was in press. The addition of these two standards brings the number of currently available Z39 standards to seven.

Nine standards were submitted to the members of Z39 for approval. They included: Bibliographic References, Writing of Abstracts, Title Leaves of a Book, Advertising of Books, Identification Number for Serial Publications*, Directories of Libraries and Information Centers*, Romanization of Japanese, Romanization of Arabic, and Transliteration of Slavic Cyrillic Characters. All but the Bibliographic References proposal were approved and sent to ANSI for action.

Three subcommittees circulated Drafts for Comment; the drafts covered Standard Book Numbers, Preparation of Scientific Papers, and Scientific and Technical Reports: Format and Production.

Subcommittee 28 on Guides for Referees of Journal Articles became inactive, with the resignation of its chairman.

As of October 1, 1970, the National Clearinghouse for Periodical Title Word Abbreviations responded to requests for 108 new word abbreviations.

Representatives from Z39 attended meetings of ISO Technical Committee 46: Working Groups on International Standard Serial Numbering, International Standard Book Numbering, Automation in Documentation, and Terminology of Documentation.

Z39 activities have continued to be supported by matching grants from the Council on Library Resources and the National Science Foundation.

---

*Approved by ANSI, November 1970.

Officers for 1970 were: Jerrold Orne, chairman, James L. Wood, vice chairman, and Harold Oatfield, secretary-treasurer. ANSI staff liaison for the year were Charles Ginder, Bertram Stanleigh and Israel Resnick.

A standard system for the numbering of technical reports is now under study, and earlier suggestions for a Standard Book Order Form will be reexamined. Z39 has also been in contact with the Music Industry Code Association with regard to its Music Industry Code, a universal numbering system for phonorecords.

With respect to problem areas, Z39 would like to express the following concerns: 1) The time lag between submission of a standard by Z39 and its eventual publication is becoming an increasingly serious problem; 2) the high cost and copyright restrictions of published ANSI standards conflict with the need for widespread and unrestricted distribution of the standards, and 3) the lack of continuity of ANSI staff assignments has been a cause for concern (Z39 has had four staff representatives in less than two years).

Brief résumés of the activities of the Z39 subcommittees follow:

SC 1 Program. No new subcommittees were organized in 1970; however, several areas of possible standardization work are under investigation.

SC 2 Machine Input Records. The proposed ANS for Bibliographic Information Interchange on Magnetic Tape was approved for publication by the Institute.

SC 3 Periodical Title Abbreviations. The ANS for the Abbreviation of Titles of Periodicals was published by the Institute in February.

SC 4 Bibliographic References. The proposed Standard for Bibliographic References was not approved by the member organizations when submitted for a vote and the subcommittee is currently reorganizing.

SC 5 Transliteration. The proposed American National Standards for the Romanization of Arabic and Japanese and the Transliteration of Slavic Cyrillic Characters were approved and sent to ANSI for action.

SC 6 Abstracts. The proposed ANS for Writing of Abstracts was approved by Z39 and forwarded to ANSI for action.

SC 8 Proof Corrections. The final version of the Standard for Proof Corrections is in preparation.

SC 9 Terminology. A new chairman was selected for this subcommittee; he will serve as the U.S. representative to Working Group 3 of ISO Technical Committee 46, Terminology of Documentation.

SC 13 Trade Catalogs and Library Directories. The proposed ANS for Directories of Libraries and Information Centers was approved by Z39 and forwarded to ANSI. The Standard for Trade Catalogs (Z39.6-1965) was reaffirmed by the Committee at its May meeting.

SC 17 Standard Book Numbering. A Draft on Standard Book Numbering was circulated for comment.

SC 19 Advertising of Books. The proposed ANS for Advertising of Books was approved and forwarded to ANSI for action.

APPENDIX M

SC 20 Standard Serial Coding. The proposed ANS Identification Number for Serial Publications was approved and forwarded to ANSI for action. The proposal was accepted as the basic working document for an international standard serials numbering system at the Oslo meeting of ISO TC/46, Working Group 1, in June.

SC 21 Title Leaves of a Book. The proposed ANS for Title Leaves of a Book was approved by Z39 and submitted to ANSI for action.

SC 22 Library Materials Price Indexes. Work continues in the subcommittee on the Draft for Comment, expected to be ready for circulation in early 1971.

SC 24 Report Literature Format. Draft No. 1, entitled Scientific and Technical Reports: Format and Production, is currently circulating for comment.

SC 25 Thesaurus Rules and Conventions. Work continues in the subcommittee on the initial Draft for Comment.

SC 26 Preparation of Scientific Papers. Two Drafts for Comment were circulated to Z39 members and others this year.

SC 27 Identification Codes for Countries, Languages, Publishers, Areas and Dates. The subcommittee is working on an initial draft of a Code for Countries; the chairman has established a liaison with the X3L8.4 subcommittee, which is also working on a country code.

SC 29 Publicity and Promotion. This subcommittee has no draft in development; it is continuing to seek ways to publicize the work of Z39.

SC 30 Identification Code for Libraries and Bookdealers. The scope of this committee was expanded to include bookdealers as well as libraries in the code under consideration.

Jerrold Orne

January 15, 1971

APPENDIX N

REPORT OF THE REPRESENTATIVE TO THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE UNION LIST OF SERIALS

During the spring of 1970, associations represented on the Joint Committee on the Union List of Serials were asked to comment on the future purpose and activity of the Joint Committee. At its spring meeting, the board of directors of the ARL suggested that the Joint Committee should continue under a revised title, such as "Joint Committee on Serials." The board members thought that such a committee could be an effective watchdog on the world of serials by reviewing important activities in the field, supporting projects of merit, and serving, when appropriate, as a project funding channel, possible because of the corporate status of the Joint Committee.

At its meeting in Detroit on June 30, 1970, the Joint Committee studied these and other views of quite similar character, which were brought forward by the representatives. The resulting consensus was that the Joint Committee should continue to exist and should be ready to provide support to appropriate projects and developments.

Committee members then discussed the Standard Serial Number (SSN). The Oslo Conference produced acceptance of the SSN concept and of the American draft standard. Papers presented at the Conference referred to the development of an international SSN center, with network connections to national centers. The attendant difficulties were recognized. While the Library of Congress has expressed interest in serving as an international center and is conducting experiments utilizing hypothetical SSN's, any centralized service function would be dependent upon adequate funding.

The committee also took note of the opposition to the SSN concept by the American Society for Testing Materials and other groups which favor CODEN. These organizations have expressed regret at not having been adequately represented in discussions of the SSN.

The National Serials Pilot Project was then reviewed and discussed for the representatives by the project director, Donald Johnson. Much interest was expressed in the progress of the project and the problems it faces, especially the uncertainty of adequate short- and long-range support which would insure further development.

The Joint Committee will welcome opportunities to contribute its efforts and those of its member organizations in such a way as to support progress in the area of serial publications.

William S. Budington

December 4, 1970

APPENDIX O

REPORT OF THE REPRESENTATIVE TO THE U.S. BOOK EXCHANGE

In my report to the ARL a year ago, I acquainted you with the use being made of USBE by ARL members, and urged your consideration of increased use on the grounds of self-interest as well as to help USBE continue to serve libraries. I announced that there would be a publicity drive by USBE and its friends to assist in persuading ARL libraries, among others, to benefit themselves and their colleagues by increasing USBE's distribution; this public relations campaign is still under way.

The situation was not good then, and in general it has not improved in 1970. So far USBE has survived, with considerable pains and difficulties, by paring expenses below a desirable operating level and by maintaining a relatively high rate of public relations activities directed at all types of libraries.

Despite the rather gloomy general outlook, I am happy to report an increase in the use by ARL members of USBE resources. Eighty-two ARL libraries are now USBE members, compared with 77 a year ago. Comprising 5 percent of USBE's total membership, the ARL libraries have ordered and received nearly 8 percent of the USBE distribution of 530,000 publications in 1970, as compared with 6 percent for 1969. Twenty-two libraries have placed more orders with USBE in 1970 than in 1969, and in six cases a great deal more. The total number of requests placed by all ARL members is higher than the previous year.

Although these developments are encouraging, there is still a wide possibility for expansion of ARL libraries' use of USBE. There are still fifteen institutions which retain membership in USBE and send in material, but do not use it at all for acquisitions. Many libraries do not make use of all or even a fair sampling of the numerous ways in which the increasing flexibility of USBE allows publications to be requested.

Part of the problem is certainly the general economic condition which finds libraries throughout the United States forced to cut down spending; and it is natural that cutbacks should have an immediate effect on the amount of retrospective buying which a library can undertake. The 8 percent which ARL libraries have received of USBE's 530,000 distribution is considerably less than the 6 percent of 629,000 in 1969. The problem is general.

Nevertheless, three things should be pointed out. First, when USBE examined its higher use members for 1970, it noted that 80 spent more than $1,000 each with USBE during the year. Of these 80, thirteen were ARL members; this is 16 percent compared with the 5 percent which ARL represents in USBE's total membership. This suggests that others in the group of large, established research libraries which is ARL could probably find value in extending their use of the USBE collections.

Secondly, the fact that USBE looks at members spending over $1,000 as (in effect) its elite membership suggests that this relatively small amount of money in a large library's acquisitions budget can be very useful to USBE and, of course, bring in a relatively large number of valuable publications because of USBE's comparatively low costs.

Finally, it appears to the board of directors of USBE that it is appropriate for the library community to take stock of the values of the organization and to make some considered judgments as to whether it should continue to exist, whether its structure and any of its functions should be changed to make it even more useful to libraries, and what the effect would be if it were to be discontinued. At this writing, USBE is waiting for the results of an application to the Council on Library Resources, Inc., for a grant to allow a thorough investigation of these questions.

It would appear that ARL members have a stake in this matter and that they will wish to take part in the decision. On this, as well as on the specific possibilities of their acquisitions use of USBE, ARL members may expect to be approached individually during the next few months.

W. Porter Kellam

January 17, 1971

APPENDIX P

REPORT OF THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
TO THE ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES
MEETING IN LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA, JANUARY 17, 1971

Legislation Relating to the Library

LC Appropriations for Fiscal 1971

Public Law 91-382 appropriated $50,396,600 for the operation of the Library of Congress for fiscal 1971. This was an increase of $3,439,600 over the fiscal 1970 level.

Under salaries and expenses, Library of Congress (Office of the Librarian, the Administrative, Reference, and Processing Departments, and the Law Library), $21,573,100 was appropriated. This allowed for 50 new positions for these units.

For operation of the Copyright Office, an appropriation of $3,594,500 was made and five new positions were authorized.

For the Legislative Reference Service, $5,178,000 was appropriated and 40 additional positions were authorized.

A total of $9,000,000 was appropriated for the Card Division. This amount included funds for Phase II of the mechanization project.

For the purchase of books for the general collections and the Law Library, a total of $940,000 was approved.

The National Books for the Blind and Physically Handicapped Program received $7,598,000.

To complete the organization and microfilming of the Papers of the Presidents, $136,000 was appropriated.

The Public Law 480 Program received $2,148,000 in U.S.-owned foreign currencies and $229,000 in U.S. dollars.

Also included in the act making appropriations for LC was an appropriation to the Architect of the Capitol of $1,555,200 for structural and mechanical care and $350,000 for furniture and furnishings for the Library. The latter appropriation was transferred to the Librarian of Congress for expenditure in accord with Public Law 91-280, which transfers authority to purchase furniture and furnishings for the Library from the Architect of the Capitol to the Librarian of Congress.

Also appropriated to the Architect of the Capitol was $15,610,000 for the Library of Congress James Madison Memorial Building. This money will allow for excavation, footings, mats and walls to the first floor, and the stone needed for the exterior of the building.

Title II-C Appropriations and Extension

A total of $6,613,500 was appropriated for Title II-C of the Higher Education Act, the National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging, for fiscal 1971. There has been no indication of the amount the President will request for fiscal 1972.

Although hearings have been held on the various bills to amend and extend the Higher Education Act, neither House has taken final action. The act, as amended in 1968, expires on June 30, 1971, but a special provision in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, approved April 13, 1970, specifies that if no action has taken place by the time the HEA authorization expires, the provisions of the 1968 act would be automatically extended for 1 year at the level authorized for the terminal year.

Copyright Law Revision

The copyright revision bill, S. 543, which the Senate subcommittee had approved on December 10, 1969, made no further progress in the Senate during 1970. It has been held up principally by the issue of cable television retransmissions of broadcast programs. At the end of June, the Federal Communications Commission released a proposed set of new rules on this issue for comment by interested persons, and the Commission is expected to act early next year to adopt new rules on which the cable television provisions in the copyright revision bill might be based.

Senator McClellan, chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the bill, announced on August 17 that no further action on the bill would be taken in the Senate this year. He added that he intended to introduce a successor revision bill in the next Congress and hoped that its consideration by the Senate Judiciary Committee could be facilitated by the FCC's promulgation of its new rules.

On the same day, August 17, Senator McClellan introduced, and the Senate passed, S. 230, to extend until December 31, 1971, all renewal copyrights that would otherwise expire before that date. This extension bill was passed by the House on December 7. Its effect, together with the five similar bills adopted in past years, is to continue until December 31, 1971, all previously renewed copyrights in which the usual 56-year term would have expired since September 19, 1962.

International Copyright

Serious problems have arisen in the field of international copyright with respect to the use in developing countries of the copyrighted works of developed countries, particularly for purposes of education. The solution written into the 1967 Stockholm revision of the Berne Convention proved to be unacceptable to the developed countries. Starting in 1968, a continuing series of international meetings has been working toward a solution agreeable to all, which is to be effected by revisions of both the Universal Copyright Convention, to which the United States belongs, and the Berne Convention. The present schedule calls for adoption of the revision proposals at diplomatic conferences in 1971.

Impending Retirement of Register of Copyrights

The Register of Copyrights announced on December 10 to the Copyright Office staff his plan to retire on August 31, 1971, following the Paris meetings on revision of the Universal and Berne Copyright Conventions and on record piracy, which he will attend and to which he must devote considerable attention. Meanwhile, to facilitate the work of the Office, the Register assigned to George D. Cary, Deputy Register of Copyrights, in addition to his regular duties, primary responsibility for the administrative functions of the Copyright Office. The Assistant Register of Copyrights, Barbara A. Ringer, will assume primary responsibility for the revision program and for international copyright matters and, to give her time to prepare for and to attend several international conferences, will be freed of her administrative assignments. The General Counsel of the Copyright Office, Abe Goldman, will continue to serve as the Office's chief legal officer, being responsible for the drafting of legislation and legal agreements, for reviewing legal memoranda and studies prepared in the Office, and for giving advice on current legislation, court cases, and legal problems of the Office.

Library of Congress James Madison Memorial Building

Ground breaking ceremonies for the James Madison Memorial Building are expected to take place in February 1971, according to the present schedule. Meanwhile, planning for the building is accelerating, as the working drawings and final space layouts are prepared. Although the basic plans for the building were approved by the Library in 1967, recent developments, including the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, which significantly changes the scope and responsibility of the Legislative Reference Service, have dictated the revision of many areas in the Madison Building. The need for more staff space to accommodate the Congressional Research Service, as the LRS will be called in the future (see later section on CRS), will probably require the utilization of compact shelving on a much broader scale than had originally been contemplated.

It is expected that funds for Phase III, the superstructure of the building, will be requested by the Office of the Architect of the Capitol in the 1972 budget. If approved by the Congress, planning could proceed without interruption. Assuming that present schedules are maintained, the working drawings will be completed by August 1, 1971. Completion of the building is expected late in 1974 or early in 1975. The move into the new building will require a number of months, but should be complete by July 1976.

National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging

The appropriation, as mentioned above, for the operation of the Title II-C Program in fiscal 1971 was $6,613,500, an increase of $802,050 over fiscal 1970. This made possible a moderate expansion of NPAC efforts abroad, with emphasis on Romania, Spain, and Southeast Asia. It also helped to defray inflationary increases in basic costs, such as for books, supplies, communications, utilities, rental of equipment, and obligatory pay raises. The special handling of TDQ (Title Delayed Query) reports from participating libraries is being resumed. These TDQ reports provide a regular follow-up of participating libraries' reports and of LC's purchase orders to assure the minimum of delay in supplying card copy. They serve the dual purpose of providing systematic "tracers" in the acquisitions system and "nudges" for titles in process of being cataloged.

On October 22, 1970, several years of negotiations were brought to a successful conclusion when the Director of the Central State Library of Romania and the Librarian of Congress formally signed a shared cataloging agreement on behalf of their respective institutions. The agreement is to take effect on January 1, 1971, and should result in the rapid and comprehensive provision to LC of Romanian publications and of the bibliographic information about these publications that is prepared for the Romanian National Bibliography by the Central State Library.

In December 1970 the Assistant Director for Acquisitions and Overseas Operations, Processing Department, visited Spain to resume negotiations with officers of the Biblioteca Nacional and the Director General de Archivos y Bibliotecas concerning the possible establishment of a shared cataloging operation in Spain. Earlier plans for such an operation were postponed because of funding uncertainties.

The expansion of the Indonesian multiple acquisitions program to include Malaysia, Singapore, and Brunei, took place late in August 1970. There are 14 participants in the expanded program and 12 in the Indonesian program proper. The bimonthly accessions list issued by the Djakarta office was renamed the Accessions List: Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore, and Brunei and, beginning with the November issue, became a monthly. The willingness of research libraries to support this program financially is evidence of the great interest in publications from this geographic area and of the effectiveness of the program itself.

By the summer of 1970 the local staff of the shared cataloging office in Vienna had achieved a degree of self-sufficiency that permitted LC to transfer its American field director back to Washington and to assign to a local employee responsibility for supervision of the cataloging operation. This brings to five the number of overseas shared cataloging centers operating completely under local direction.

The printing of catalog cards for titles in Oriental characters has always been attended by technical difficulties and corresponding delays. To improve the quality and hasten the availability of its cards for Japanese titles, the Library is currently engaged in a pilot project, with the concurrence of the Government Printing Office, whereby the typesetting of both the roman letters and the Japanese characters will be done in Tokyo under the supervision of the NPAC office there. The results to date have been very encouraging.

Of the many special projects undertaken by the Library's acquisitions office in Rio de Janeiro, one of the most significant was the conclusion of arrangements for the commercial microfilming of the leading Brazilian newspaper, *O Estado de São Paulo*, from its first issue of January 4, 1875, through August 31, 1956. The fiscal year also saw an increase of 33 percent in serial receipts, with the total number of periodical issues received amounting to 11,227. Approximately 3,300 Brazilian monographs of value to scholarship were acquired. The total number of pieces received from Brazil amounted to 22,809.

Receipts from Eastern Africa increased from 19,073 pieces in fiscal 1969 to 24,025 in fiscal 1970. The third volume of the quarterly *Accessions List: Eastern Africa* contains the first annual index as well as the annual serial supplement.

It is still evident that the general economic recovery in Indonesia has not yet reached the publishing industry, although there is some indication that matters are slowly improving. Total receipts in fiscal 1970 were 159,077 pieces (or an average of about 14,500 pieces per set for the 11 participants including LC) compared with 190,770 pieces in fiscal 1969. The decrease was also partly attributable to the withdrawal of one participating library and to the sending of only selected serials and newspapers.

Acquisitions reports continue to flow in from the 86 participating libraries which are maintaining depository sets of LC cards. From the beginning of the program through November 1970, 497,972 reports have been searched, resulting in orders being placed for 105,508 titles. In fiscal 1970 orders were placed for 27,993 or 19.6 percent of all reports received, as compared with 26.2 percent in 1967, the first full year of the program. It is hoped that this downward trend, reflecting the increasing comprehensiveness of LC's acquisitions network in shared cataloging countries, will continue. In addition to insuring acquisition of all important research titles, these reports help to identify the specific titles being acquired elsewhere and thus serve to upgrade the cataloging priority of current imprints received from the 22 countries covered by shared cataloging arrangements.

Public Law 480 Programs

Public Law 480 offices have nearly completed distribution of lists of PL-480 code numbers identifying printed catalog cards available for publications distributed by the programs through 1968.

In August the Library's office in Belgrade distributed to participants a list of 1,595 Yugoslav serials acquired by the program there. The list includes all serials, including a selection of numbered monographic series. In October the Tel Aviv office distributed to participants in the Israel program a "Numerical List of Titles Published Annually or Less Frequently." Each participating library has been asked to select from that list the serials that it wishes to receive during the coming year.

As a result of a special effort to obtain publications from research and academic institutions and learned societies, the New Delhi office added 169 serial titles to its distribution list during the first quarter of the fiscal year. Sixteen serials ceased publication or were dropped from the list during the same period. Coverage of Nepalese publications has improved significantly in the past few months, thanks largely to the Library's new blanket-order dealer in Kathmandu. The total number of monographic titles acquired by the New Delhi office, however, dropped by more than 20 percent during the first quarter of this fiscal year, because of a severe paper shortage in India, which threatens to become worse.

An important project is now nearing a successful resolution. The romanization table for Sindhi, on which the New Delhi office has worked for some time, has been accepted by LC and referred to the American Library Association for concurrence. As soon as a final decision is reached, LC will begin printing catalog cards for Sindhi publications.

APPENDIX P

Exchange and Gift Division Activities

Non-GPO Imprints

Non-GPO Imprints Received in the Library of Congress, July 1967 through December 1969: A Selective Checklist was issued on an experimental basis late in August 1970. The publication attempts to bring under bibliographical control some of the United States Government publications printed outside the Government Printing Office. Prepared by the Federal Documents Section of the Exchange and Gift Division, the Checklist is limited to those non-GPO imprints deemed to be of some research or informational value and which fall outside the scope of the Monthly Catalog of United States Government Publications as well as the other main bibliographies of Government and Government-sponsored publications. The Checklist is divided into two sections. The first contains 1,112 monographs and monographs in series. These entries are arranged alphabetically by corporate heading and numbered so that they may be approached through the subject index. The other section lists periodicals, also arranged alphabetically by corporate heading, but unnumbered since no subject headings have been assigned to them. The Checklist is for sale by the Card Division for $1.25.

The Exchange and Gift Division is interested in learning of users' reactions to Non-GPO Imprints. Comments and suggestions of librarians and other users of U. S. Government documents would be appreciated. They should be addressed to the Chief, Exchange and Gift Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D. C. 20540.

Non-GPO Listings in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications

The Monthly Catalog is now listing nearly all of the agency-printed U. S. Government documents referred to it by the Exchange and Gift Division's Federal Documents Section, omitting mainly those which are considered purely administrative or local in character; preliminary reports; maps and telephone directories not sold by the Government Printing Office; items on which the name of the issuing body is not given; programs of meetings; and publications which cannot be reproduced or distributed without the permission of the issuing agency. It is from this body of material that selections were made for inclusion in Non-GPO Imprints reported above. Of the 1,740 publications sent to the Monthly Catalog editorial staff for consideration from July 1, 1970, through November 30, 1970, 1,621 were entered in the Monthly Catalog. Of the remaining items, 18 titles were rejected and 101 returned as duplicates of items already received by the Monthly Catalog.

State Documents

In response to recommendations set forth in the introduction to the sixtieth anniversary issue of the Monthly Checklist of State Publications (December 1969), the Council of State Governments has included in its annual publication, 1971 Suggested State Legislation, a suggested model law to require the deposit of State publications in the Library of Congress. At present, 21 States have enacted laws requiring distribution of specified types of publications to LC and nine have laws requiring at least one copy of each State publication to be sent to the Library. The suggested legislation specifies that copies of the session laws, codes, or statutes, sets of legislative journals, and copies of court reports and all other official publications be sent to the Library, and specifies the number of copies desired by LC. The suggested legislation is offered with the advice that this type of action has proved to be a very effective means of broadening the coverage of the Monthly Checklist of State Publications.

Cataloging

A build-up of staffing levels in the subject cataloging and shelflisting operations is already showing dramatic results. The Shelflisting Section is currently making it possible to print catalog cards for about 6,000 titles a week through a combination of increased staff, increased productivity, and a backlog to feed upon in addition to its input of new work. This cannot be maintained indefinitely because the backlog will be cleared out after a while and output will revert to the level of new input from subject catalogers. At present it appears that LC's fiscal 1971 output of new printed card cataloging will be in the vicinity of 250,000, a sizeable increase over 1970's previous record of almost 219,000 titles. A second benefit resulting from the more satisfactory balance of staff in the various phases of the cataloging operation is the greatly diminished likelihood that titles in the middle priorities will be shunted into backlogs as they pass through the system.

Classification Schedules

In August the fourth edition of the classification schedule for Class N (Fine Arts) was published. Unlike its predecessors, this edition not only incorporates all additions and changes made since the third edition up to October 1969 but represents a thorough-going revision. The most striking innovations of this revision are the regrouping of numbers for similar types of publications, which had heretofore been dispersed in several places (e.g., works on art collectors and patrons have been brought closer to material on private collections), and the combining in the same numerical sequence of works on the history of art in a particular medium with books of reproductions of works in the same medium. There has also been some relocation in order to provide a more logical arrangement of general works and works on the techniques and materials of various art forms. A new subclass NX has been added; it deals with the arts in general, including literature and the performing arts as well as the visual arts. This schedule is the first in a series of new editions of classification schedules which employs a new format. It has been printed by photo-offset from typewritten camera copy on one side of the page only. This type of reproduction offers a considerable saving in typesetting costs and proofreading time and it provides a suitable format for libraries using the schedule to make annotations, to punch the pages for a loose-leaf binder, and to insert pages from the L.C. Classification--Additions and Changes for updating.

The second edition of the Outline of the Library of Congress Classification was published in September. This edition is more detailed than the previous edition and reflects extensive developments in all classification schedules during the last three decades, with particular emphasis on Class Q (Science) and Class T (Technology).

In the same month a draft outline of Class K (Law) was published. This outline of the future subclasses of Class K was prepared in response to requests from other libraries for some form of synopsis of this class that will assist them, pending completion of Class K, in arranging legal collections to conform with the Library of Congress classification. As a result of the preparation of an overall notation scheme, the letters KD were assigned to British law in lieu of KE as originally envisaged. Because of a temporary shortage of staff, work on the development of subclass KD proceeded at a slower pace than anticipated and completion of that subclass cannot be expected until sometime in 1971. A fifth segment of the Class KF Shelflist, resulting from the retrospective classification of holdings of the Library in the field of United States law, became available from the Photoduplication Service.

Work on revised editions of Classes T (Technology) and Q (Science) proceeded towards publication in 1971.

Decimal Classification Activities

The text of Dewey 18 was completed and sent to press, with publication expected in mid-1971. Work was begun on the tenth abridged edition and publication of this edition is anticipated for late summer of 1971.

Liaison has continued with British users, both in the assignment of numbers by the Library of Congress and the British National Bibliography for the same title, and in the appointment for the first time of a British representative to membership on the Decimal Classification Editorial Policy Committee. (A Canadian representative was also appointed.) As a result of the BNB's announcement that it would begin to use Dewey 18 for classification of new British titles published after January 1, 1971, beginning a new five-year cumulation which is to be arranged completely by Dewey 18, LC also decided to begin using Dewey 18 for works classified after January 1, 1971.

Assignment of Dewey numbers continued at the high level of the preceding 2 years, covering virtually all titles in English cataloged by the Library and comprising a third of LC's cataloging output.

Cataloging in Publication

During the summer and fall of 1970 Verner W. Clapp, the Library of Congress staff, and the Association of American Publishers (AAP) planned and executed the first and principal part of a campaign to inform the publishing industry of the nature of Cataloging in Publication (CIP) and to enlist their support by pointing out the advantages of participating in the program. In addition to a mailing to all the members of the AAP explaining the program and asking for a commitment in principle to cooperate, an open meeting for publishers was held in New York on September 21 with a panel of speakers consisting of Mr. Clapp, a librarian, a publisher, and an LC staff member. The projected program was explained in detail and the attending publishers had ample opportunity to have their questions answered.

The result of this effort has been the receipt of a sufficient number of expressions of willingness to cooperate that AAP, Mr. Clapp, and LC are convinced that the program should proceed, with good expectation of broad participation from the industry. Plans have been worked out as to how the program would be operated and detailed estimates have been made of the extra costs that would be involved. On the basis of these estimates the Librarian of Congress made a formal request for a grant from the Council on Library Resources, Inc., to enable the Library to embark on a CIP program beginning in January 1971 and continuing until Federal support for the program can be obtained, presumably in fiscal 1974. The present objective is to reach an annual level of 30,000 titles with CIP by June 30, 1972. The Council considered the Library's request favorably on November 21 but was not in a position to make a grant in the amount needed. It is currently exploring the possibility of finding the money through a cooperative agreement among funding agencies.

APPENDIX P

Card Distribution Service

By the end of June 1970 it was clear that the crisis in the card distribution service had passed. Service had improved, the transition to the complete use of machine-readable order forms had been carried out with a minimum of complaint from subscribers, and gross sales reached $7,000,000, an all-time high but still $1,000,000 less than the $8,000,000 appropriated for the activity. Since July 1970 service has continued to improve, and the Card Division is now able to fill 75 percent of incoming orders at initial receipt. The turnaround time from receipt of order to shipment of cards (for in-stock titles) has averaged 7 working days during the last 4 months. Further progress has been made in shortening the time to fill orders for out-of-stock titles.

The major problem facing the Card Division now that it is able to provide better service is finding ways to stimulate card orders, which are down approximately 17 percent during the first 5 months of the present fiscal year. Although the figures for net card sales are higher (without an increase in card prices) than those for the corresponding 5-month period last year, it is apparent that the volume of orders received (currently running at the rate of approximately 10,000,000 per year) must increase if the Card Division is to fulfill the legal obligation of returning to the Treasury the cost plus 10 percent.

Card Division Mechanization Project

The target date for implementation of Phase II of CARDS (Card Automated Reproduction and Distribution System) is now set for March 1, 1971. All programs for use in the system have been completed and are ready for testing in a production environment. Renovation of the physical facility will be completed early in January with installation of equipment scheduled for January 15, 1971. One month of testing will follow installation. In the Card Division, steps have been taken to insure a smooth interface between Phase I, the clerical supporting operation, and Phase II. No interruption to, or deterioration of, service is anticipated during the introduction of Phase II into the system.

Changes in Typography on LC Printed Cards

Some minor changes in the typography of all newly set printed cards will be instituted early in 1971 because of certain typographical limitations in the production of printed cards from masters produced from MARC computer tapes through Phase II of the Card Division Mechanization Project. Among these will be the elimination of italics.

Card Prices

There will be no increase in the price of LC printed catalog cards ordered by card number or by author and title during the fiscal year that ends on June 30, 1971. Although salaries and the cost of card stock continue to rise, the Library is making every effort to offset these increases by economies in operation. A review of card prices will be necessary after the close of the present fiscal year.

Standard Number of Cards Per Order

Beginning February 1, 1971, the Card Division will discontinue use of formulas for number of copies wanted and will begin to supply a standard set of eight cards for each order received. Present stocks of machine-readable order forms may continue to be used, but the formula for the number of copies wanted will be disregarded. In most cases the new set system will provide the number of cards equivalent to the present 3 SAT formula: a main entry card, a shelflist card, a card for each subject and added entry tracing, and an extra card. The price will be 35 cents per set for orders submitted by card number and 75 cents per set for orders placed by author and title, the same as the price for the average order placed by quantity formula now. Although subscribers may receive one or two more cards under the standard set system than they do under the formula system, simplification in billing, accounting, and card drawing will compensate for the cost of additional card stock. Subscribers may order any multiple of the standard set by sending in separate slips for each set desired.

A standard set is an essential element in keeping card prices as low as possible,particularly as the Card Division implements the printing-on-demand system which Phase II of the mechanization program will provide. The standard set system is also a desirable element in the Phase I program, through which orders are processed by machine but cards are drawn from stock manually.

Realignment of Responsibility for Card Catalogs and Publication of Book Catalogs

A reorganization within the Processing Department on August 1, 1970, involved its Catalog Maintenance and Catalog Publication Division, its Union Catalog Division, and the International Organizations Section of the General Reference and Bibliography Division, Reference Department. The former Catalog Maintenance and Catalog Publication Division was divided along functional lines to create two new divisions. The maintenance of the Library's card catalogs was assigned to the newly created Catalog Management Division, while the publication of the Library's book catalogs became the responsibility of the newly created Catalog Publication Division.

APPENDIX P

The Union Catalog Division was dissolved and the reference service on book locations and bibliographic information recorded in the National Union Catalog (published and unpublished) and in various auxiliary union catalogs in Oriental and Slavic languages was shifted to the Union Catalog and International Organizations Reference Section, General Reference and Bibliography Division. As part of its service, this section prepares and circulates to approximately 75 research libraries the Weekly List of Unlocated Research Books. The telephone number for reference inquiries is 202-426-6300. Written requests should be addressed: Library of Congress, Union Catalog Reference Unit, Washington, D. C. 20540.

Matters concerning reports to the NUC (i.e., the transmission of catalog cards of any imprint date by libraries to the NUC), and replies to inquiries concerning reporting criteria are the responsibility of the Catalog Publication Division. This division is located in the Massachusetts Avenue Annex, 214 Massachusetts Avenue, N.E. The address is Library of Congress, Catalog Publication Division, Washington, D. C. 20540.

Book Catalogs

National Union Catalog--Author List, 1969 Annual

As previously announced, efforts to reduce the waiting period before the appearance of the annual cumulations of the NUC have continued. Editing and preparation of camera copy for the 1969 annual was accomplished at an accelerated rate, and the set was distributed in partial shipments. As a consequence the earlier volumes reached subscribers well ahead of the final shipment of the complete set during the week of November 16, 1970. This was accomplished despite the fact that the 1969 annual was the largest ever published. In its 13 volumes are listed 298,817 titles and over 670,000 locations.

Books: Subjects 1965-1969

The editing and preparing of page copy for the Books: Subjects 1965-69 quinquennial cumulation was completed in mid-November 1970 and the final shipment of copy to J. W. Edwards, Inc., was made on December 1, 1 month ahead of schedule. It is estimated that this cumulation contains 1.1 million subject entries for 650,000 titles of post-1944 imprints. This is the first Books: Subjects quinquennial to show the full impact of LC's expanded overseas acquisitions and cataloging programs under Public Law 480 and Title II-C of the Higher Education Act. The success of these programs is reflected in the size of this cumulation, which is almost twice that of the previous quinquennial, and in the extensive listings found under numerous foreign literature headings. The complete set will have 27,133 pages in 42 volumes and will be available from J. W. Edwards at $445 per set. Delivery to subscribers is expected early in 1971.

Publication of the Pre-1956 National Union Catalog

At the end of November 1970, 97 shipments containing 2,585,385 edited cards had been forwarded by the National Union Catalog Project to Mansell Information/Publishing, Ltd. Volumes 1-52 and 57-114 had been published and distributed, with volumes 53-56 reserved for the Bible, and eight additional volumes were in various stages of printing and binding. A separate volume, entitled A Bibliography of the Catholic Church from the NUC Pre-1956 Imprints, had been announced by Mansell for release in October 1970. This section, comprising the main and added entries for the Catholic Church with its organizational and form subdivisions, amounts to some 16,000 entries. It constitutes one of the largest bibliographies in book form of the publications issued by the administrative, legislative, and judicial organs of the Church and the largest listing of its official liturgical literature.

National Register of Microform Masters

The 1969 issue of the National Register of Microform Masters, distributed in November 1970, is devoted exclusively to serials, and is a complete and updated cumulation which supersedes the serials sections of the 1966, 1967, and 1968 issues. The earlier issues, however, must continue to be used to locate entries for monographs until a comparable cumulation for monographs in the new alphabetical format (now in progress) can be completed.

Efforts are underway to encourage improved and expanded reporting to the National Register of Microform Masters. In particular, it will be urged that reports be in the form of a standard catalog card entry. Reports in this form, long proven effective in the National Union Catalog, can be much more readily and rapidly processed than can typed lists, printed publishers' catalogs, and the like.

Newspapers on Microfilm

Preliminary work has begun on a new edition (the seventh) of Newspapers on Microfilm. Current workload estimates indicate that this edition will include over 42,000 titles of domestic and foreign newspapers, compared with 21,700 titles in the sixth edition. A publication date for this new edition has not yet been set. Guidelines detailing procedures for reporting to the National Register of Microform Masters and to Newspapers on Microfilm have been drafted and will be available when printed. These, and pre-addressed postage-free mailing labels, may be obtained from the Catalog Publication Division upon request.

New Serial Titles, 1961-1970

A solicitation for offers to publish in five volumes a decennial edition of New Serial Titles covering the years 1961-1970 was issued to prospective publishers November 6, 1970. The low bidder was Rowman & Littlefield. The cumulation will be priced at $149.25 and should be available late in 1972.

Standard Serial Number

The Standard Serial Number (SSN), as designed by Subcommittee 20 of Z-39, was adopted as a standard by the American National Standards Institute on November 18. The following day the Library submitted a proposal to the Council on Library Resources requesting funds to support assignment of SSN's to all new serial titles. As of this writing, the Council has not yet taken action on this proposal. In anticipation of a favorable response, all new titles cataloged by LC or reported to LC by other libraries are being coded, on an experimental basis, in the MARC serials format.

Automation

In June 1970, the automation activities in the Library of Congress were divided between the Processing Department and the Administrative Department. The newly created MARC Development Office in the Processing Department assumed the responsibility for the MARC/RECON Projects and all aspects of automation involving technical processes and various operational uses of the MARC data base for the Processing Department and the Reference Department. The Information Systems Office in the Administrative Department continues its responsibility for coordination of the overall automation program of the Library, including budget management and projects in support of the Legislative Reference Service, the Copyright Office, and the Administrative Department.

Computer Center Operations

A major part of the effort of the Information Systems Office during the past 6 months has been upon upgrading and improving the effectiveness of the central computer facility, and upon achieving greater standardization and new capabilities in the computer programming activity.

The workload, especially the on-line applications in the teleprocessing network, increased to such an extent that an additional computer was needed, which could serve both as back-up for the on-line applications and as a separate batch processor. Consequently, a second IBM 360/40 was installed in July after the computer room itself was expanded. Steps were started immediately to shift to the more flexible and efficient operating system, OS/360, in place of the former DOS system. The programs already converted are running more rapidly and reliably than under the old system.

The preparation of an internal automation standards and procedures manual was undertaken to promote the use of common principles and practices throughout LC. This manual will foster standardization of practices and will enhance vital communication between individual automation activities. A companion document to be known as the automation resources manual will contain an inventory of all hardware and software available in the Library. The two manuals should result in more efficient use of programing manpower and computer time.

LC Data Organization and Terminal Requirements Studies

Contracts for studies concerned with long-range data organization and terminal problems within LC have been completed. The study of data organization deals with (1) the efficient organization of the directly accessible, machine-readable file as it grows vastly larger and (2) the choice of a computer operating system which offers the best match for the file design recommended. The study evaluates many alternatives for grouping, accessing, and storing the constitutent data elements which may be required in the central bibliographic operations. The final part of the study evaluates 31 computer operating systems against the data processing needs dictated by the recommended file design.

The second study focuses upon the terminal--the critical tool with which the librarian will interact with an on-line, directly accessible file. This study was divided into three phases: (1) an analysis of user requirements as identified in earlier studies, (2) a survey of the state-of-the-art in terminal production, and (3) a predictive evaluation of technology vis-a-vis the requirements. Seventeen key types of LC work stations were identified, made up of various combinations of a set of 13 terminal modules. Data on the "art" were derived from 200 responses received in a survey of 500 manufacturers and suppliers. The module-by-module approach is significant in that it provides a basis for efficient production, selectivity in choosing suppliers, and selective replacement of faulty components. One conclusion of the analysis was that the Library's requirement regarding character sets is the major constraining factor in the availability of two of the 13 modules, specifically, printers and visual displays.

APPENDIX P

Reference Department Application

Four Reference Department application efforts of possible interest to other libraries continued during the past 6 months. A program for "typesetting" the directory publications of the Science and Technology Division's National Referral Center on the Government Printing Office's Linotron photocomposition device was tested. Programs for updating the automated data file of the National Directory of Latin Americanists, maintained by the Hispanic Foundation, were being completed. The Manuscript Master Record program, which controls the shelflist of collections in the Manuscript Division and records their use, was modified. The program used for the publication of the bibliography for the Cold Regions Research and Engineering Laboratory was revised as necessary.

Legislative Reference Service Applications

Systems definition for the LRS automated information system, the generation of an integrated data base for the Service's citation file and indexing terms vocabulary, maintenance of the Selective Dissemination of Information service for researchers in LRS, computer production of catalog listings and catalog cards, the continuing development study on the computer system for the Digest of Public GeneralBills, and the selection of an expanded information retrieval system for use by LRS and the Congress are examples of the joint efforts of the LRS and ISO staffs. Additional text-editing capabilities for LRS on-line applications were also provided during the fall of 1970. ISO is preparing for the surge of new requirements that will result from the expanded mission of LRS as it becomes the Congressional Research Service next year under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970.

Copyright Office Applications

Studies for the design of an automated in-process and fiscal-control information system for fee services performed by the Copyright Office were concluded during December 1970. A pilot project for the control of certain deposit-account aspects of fee services began formal system testing on December 7, 1970. Specifications for the programing of a large part of the remainder of the control records of the Copyright Office's fee services were also completed during December 1970. These computer programs, which are written in COBOL, and the accompanying computer systems techniques will provide prototype systems for handling deposit-account and individual-cash transactions by other offices in the Library.

Management Information System (MIS) Applications

Continued attention was given to applying computer technology to LC's business operations in the areas of budget, personnel, and payroll accounting. This included work on the adaptation of an improved and flexible payroll system from which both financially oriented and personnel-related systems will grow. Improvements were also made in such specific areas as the Telephone Directory, Medical-Health Facilities Use System, Personnel Data System, and Budget Feedback Report System. All of these activities are building toward information system products that will enable the management of the Library to improve the allocation and conservation of the human, financial, and material resources available to them.

MARC

The MARC Editorial Office has continued to consolidate its position as a production operation. Until recently the Current Unit of this office, with only minor delays, has met its responsibility to convert to machine-readable form the bibliographic data for all English-language monographs currently cataloged by LC and to distribute this information weekly to subscribers. However, faced with higher receipts than anticipated, backlogs have developed in the past few months, resulting in delays in the distribution of the MARC records to subscribers. Revised procedures, such as restriction of input by date or place of publication, use of staff assistance from other divisions, and an increased MARC Ed staff should make it possible to accommodate the increased input and to restore currency to the MARC Distribution Service. MARC Ed has distributed approximately 100,000 records during its year and a half of operation. With the addition of new equipment in the Library's Computer Service Center, LC has assumed responsibility for all aspects of the distribution service. Until recently, tapes were duplicated for the subscribers by the Argonne National Laboratory.

Design specifications are being prepared for a new MARC Processing System. The new system, to be designed as a data utility, will be capable of processing machine-readable records regardless of the source of the record (e.g., MARC Editorial Office, preliminary cataloging, Geography and Map Division, etc.), the content of the record (e.g., the bibliographic description of a book, serial, map, etc.), or the master file in which the record will eventually reside. The system will include all the processing required to store, maintain, and retrieve records in both on-line and off-line modes and can maintain files on either disc or tape. Access to records will be provided by a variety of indexing methods, i.e., unique number, author, title, etc. The on-line subsystem will also include the display logic for several terminal devices such as a CRT or a typewriter-like device.

APPENDIX P

Work is continuing on additional MARC formats. Maps: A MARC Format and Serials: A MARC Format were printed for LC by the Government Printing Office during the summer of 1970 and are available from the Superintendent of Documents. Formats for film material, manuscripts, and sound recordings are in process.

RECON

The RECON Unit, the production aspect of a 24-month study of the feasibility of converting retrospective cataloging data to machine-readable form, has completed the conversion of the 1969 and "7" series cards representing English-language monographs cataloged for LC during 1968 and 1969 and is in the process of converting the 1968 records. The RECON 1969 records (approximately 9,000) will be made available to the MARC Distribution Service subscribers.

Several studies are being undertaken as part of the RECON Pilot Project. The Library is developing a technique called format recogniton, which will allow the computer to process unedited catalog records by examining data strings for certain keywords, significant punctuation, and other clues to determine the appropriate tags, indicators, and subfield codes. The logical design of format recognition has been published as a separate report by the American Library Association under the title Format Recognition Process for MARC Records: A Logical Design. The programs are expected to be operational in February 1971.

Since the production operations of the RECON Pilot Project have been limited to English-language monographs in the 1968, 1969, and "7" series card numbers, it was recognized that many problems concerning retrospective records would not be revealed in the conversion of relatively current titles. For this reason, a study to identify and analyze 5,000 older titles was included as part of the pilot project. These titles consisted of records for older English-language monographs and foreign-language monographs in the roman alphabet. The study revealed the necessity of having a higher level of personnel to process retrospective and foreign-language material because of the need to interpret different cataloging rules, to be proficient in foreign languages, etc. The investigation also revealed the difficulty of expanding the MARC Distribution Service or the format-recognition algorithms to foreign languages because of a lack of consistency in shared cataloging copy.

Several research projects have also been undertaken by the RECON Working Task Force, a working group of outside librarians. A study on levels of completeness for MARC records has been finished, and the report was published in the June 1970 issue of the Journal of Library Automation. Investigations are also being conducted on the implications of a national union catalog in machine-readable form and the possible utilization of other machine-readable data bases for use in a national bibliographic store.

Staff members involved in the RECON Project and in the MARC System have been working closely with the technical staff for Phase II of the Card Division Mechanization Project in developing printing specifications for the Videocomp printed card production.

Progress reports of the RECON Pilot Project have appeared in the June and September 1970 issues of the Journal of Library Automation.

Other Processing Department Automation Projects

The design and detailed specifications for Phase I of the Order Division Project (automation of regular orders) has been completed, and the actual programing for this phase has begun. Phase I consists of three tasks: Task I includes file conversion and the procedures and programs to record regular order information and to print via the computer basic documents such as the purchase order, dealer slip, order file slip, process file slip, notification to recommending officer, and obligation record; Task II consists of the fiscal control subsystem; and Task III is the process control subsystem. Task I is scheduled for completion in February 1971, and Tasks II and III will be started in the spring of 1971.

A processing system is being developed that will enable the Library to assume the responsibility of file maintenance and publication of the LC Subject Heading List. These tasks are presently being handled by the Government Printing Office. Functions to be performed include conversion of records from the GPO printing format to the MARC subject-headings format, implementation of a file-maintenance system to correct these records, and publication procedures to prepare the data for output via the Linotron. Many of the same programs will also be used to maintain the file and produce the Combined Index to the LC Classification Schedules. The initial work for the combined index project is expected to be carried out by the Columbia University School of Library Service under contract to the Library of Congress.

During the past year, work has continued on the serials format in terms of updating and its eventual republication. Simulation of the processes necessary to convert serial information into machine-readable form has been carried out in cooperation with the staff of the Serial Record Division. Work is also in process to expand the MARC System to accept serial data so that serial titles can be input for special projects, such as the Main Reading Room and Science Reading Room Catalog Projects.

APPENDIX P

Abbreviated computer-produced book catalogs using MARC data are being developed for the Main Reading Room and Science Reading Room reference collections. These catalogs will be produced using an existing generalized print program. The problems of producing such complex and sophisticated products as the National Union Catalog using photocomposition devices are being studied. The Library of Congress catalog for motion pictures and filmstrips has been selected as the first major book catalog to be produced from machine-readable data via a photocomposition device. Implementation of this project will not begin until fiscal 1972.

One of the biggest problems connected with the production of large book catalogs has been the difficulty of programing the computer to arrange bibliographic entries according to established library filing rules. As the first step in solving this problem, a simplified filing arrangement has been proposed by the Technical Processes Research Office (TPR).

Staff members from the MARC Development Office have been working with the Descriptive Cataloging Division in planning for Cataloging in Publication. CIP records will be converted to machine-readable form after all the CIP cataloging data have been added and will be distributed to MARC subscribers. When the book is received in the Library and the additional cataloging data have been included in the catalog record, the full MARC record will be produced. CIP records will not be transferred to the Card Division for printed card production until they have been updated to a full MARC record.

MARC Reference Department Projects

Several projects have been undertaken by the MARC Development Office for various divisions of the Reference Department. In addition to the book catalogs being produced for the reading rooms mentioned above, a weekly listing on 3x5 cards of all new records added to the map data base during a week is being produced for the Geography and Map Division. The cards are arranged in call number order for the map shelflist. Monthly and quarterly cumulative listings arranged by author, subject, and geographic area, are also being produced.

MARC Data Base Products

Several special products are being obtained from records in the MARC data base. For example, retrieval by call number is being done for an American Revolution Bicentennial bibliography and for the Science and Technology Division. A listing of books not classed as music (M) but with the term "music" appearing in the collation statement is being produced for the Music Division. In addition, the General Reference and

Bibliography Division is receiving printouts of MARC records for publications which are conference proceedings or translations.

Other retrieval runs included the following: number of titles by country (a count of the number of titles on the data base from each major English-speaking country); a listing of the publisher in order of frequency of appearance in records on the data base (with a companion listing of these publishers in alphabetical order); classification number-subject heading correlation (listing arranged by class number with subject headings from the MARC records); and classification number-subject heading correlation in the LC subject heading list (listing arranged by class number with associated subject headings).

Technical Processes Research Office

A study completed recently describes the Process Information File, one of the Library's important instruments of bibliographic control, and considers the merits of automating it. This single-entry file records an estimated 357,000 titles on order or under preliminary cataloging control and gives their locations. Since the file is the primary source of information about these titles until they are represented by printed cards in the regular catalogs, it is used hundreds of times each working day by staff members in all parts of the Library.

Automating the Process Information File would allow more ways to locate in-process records, improve the quality of the file, and make possible an enhanced current-awareness service for staff members concerned with new acquisitions. An automated Process Information File might also serve as a prototype for an automated catalog. A preliminary analysis of hardware/software requirements for such a project has been completed by the MARC Development Office.

As mentioned above, work has continued on the revision and expansion of a set of proposed rules for file arrangement for the LC book catalogs. These rules are being used as the foundation for the joint effort of TPR and the MARC Development Office to devise techniques for achieving desired arrangements by computer. A conceptual framework for a full-scale filing program has been designed and algorithms are being formulated to handle specific filing situations. Techniques to handle situations not amenable to algorithmic solutions also are being developed.

TPR has assisted the MARC Development Office in developing a method for merging the machine-readable tapes of the seventh edition of the LC subject heading list and its supplements.

APPENDIX P

The U. S. National Libraries Task Force on Automation and Other Cooperative Services

Continuing its review of the ARL-administered National Serials Pilot Project, the task force of representatives from the three national libraries focused attention on bibliographic problems relating to automated serials controls and on short- and long-range automation planning and progress in the three libraries. In July the heads of systems planning in NAL, NLM, and LC gave detailed presentations to the task force on the status of the automation activities in their respective institutions. This review brought out the essentiality of standard library codes and the need to address more attention to human-factor problems in the preparation of source data.

The Subject Heading Working Group has agreed upon a single list of form sub-headings that it is prepared to recommend for adoption by the three libraries. It has also developed a standard format for scope notes that will define these sub-headings. The Acquisitions Working Group has continued its activity in influencing the design of automated segments of ordering processes.

The most recent sessions of the task force have concentrated on the problem of design and choice of entries for the National Serials Pilot Project, related preliminary planning for future assignment of Standard Serial Numbers, the relationship of the SSN to the prospective international numbering code, and planning for the next phases and funding of the national serials activity. The national libraries have agreed on policies and interim support for this basic program, including its transfer to the Library of Congress upon conclusion of the ARL sponsorship. On November 18 the task force sponsored a full day's discussion at NAL in a search for feasible solutions to bibliographic problems encountered by the National Serials Pilot Project in its work toward the building of a national serials data base, problems complicated by the fact that serial entries in the internal files of the individual libraries vary in accordance with the variety of rules followed over a long period of time. The Assistant Director for Cataloging of LC's Processing Department gave a comprehensive presentation of Anglo-American rules for serial entries. Serial entry practices followed in each of the three national libraries were explained and analyzed in terms of their impact on the work of the Pilot Project.

Preservation Program

Preservation activities at LC will receive impetus from two recent appointments. On January 11, 1971, John C. Williams, Director of Research for the Cuno Division of the American Machine and Foundry Company in Meriden, Conn., will become the Research Officer and Director of the Preservation Research and Testing Laboratory. Before working for Cuno, Dr. Williams was Research Director for Hawley Products Company, where he was responsible for developing new processes in pulp molding, beater treatments, and related research in the chemistry of paper. He has been a Fellow of the Mellon Institute, and for several years was a research chemist for the Champion Paper and Fibre Company. Dr. Williams' appointment enables the Library to begin its long-planned program of research into the many and difficult problems of preserving library materials. Laboratory space is available and funds for the initial complement of scientific equipment have been provided by the Council on Library Resources. It is expected that the basic furnishings and equipment for the laboratory will be installed by May 1, that the supporting scientific staff will be on board by June 1, and that research will be underway by July 1, 1971.

On April 1, 1971, Peter Waters will become the Library's Restoration Officer. Mr. Waters will bring to the Library an international reputation as a binder and restorer of rare books and as a conservator of books and documents. The well-known partnership of Roger Powell and Peter Waters has been responsible for the restoration of such rare volumes as the Book of Dimmer, the Book of Armah, and the famed Book of Kells. More recently, Mr. Water's own studies of the Stonyhurst Gospel, a Coptic manuscript of the Gospel of St. John dating from the seventh century, have revised previous opinions regarding the binding of this important volume by offering evidence that the volume is the original seventh-century binding, not an eighteenth-century binding as some have supposed. Mr. Waters is known on both sides of the Atlantic for his efforts in establishing the restoration program at the Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale in Florence, following the flood of the Arno in 1966. At present he is a consultant to the Gulbenkian Museum in Lisbon and to the British Museum and is co-director of a research program sponsored by the Council on Library Resources at the Imperial College, London. Mr. Waters brings to the Library of Congress an expertise that places restoration activities on the highest professional and technical level.

Photoduplication Service

The Photoduplication Service continues to be active both at the national and international levels in the field of standards for documentary reproduction by photographic means. One result has been the submission to the International Standards Organization, Technical Committee 46, Subcommittee 1, of a draft document on the technical requirements for microfilming newspapers. At a time when many countries are advancing technologically in the field of documentary reproduction and are assuming the responsibility for microfilming their own newspaper files, both retrospective and current, thus making U. S. libraries increasingly dependent on the microfilm output of foreign producers, it is imperative that an international standard for this activity be adopted.

APPENDIX P

A new and revised edition of Specifications for Library of Congress Microfilming, published in 1964, is being prepared by the Photoduplication Service. In the interest of simplification, it will be produced in parts, with each one covering the microfilming of a different type of library material. Part I, which will cover the microfilming of newspapers, is in draft form and should be available in 1971.

The Photoduplication Service continues to microfilm resources that are not otherwise available from micropublishers. Circular letters announcing the availability of this material are sent to all ARL libraries on a routine basis.

Center for the Coordination of Foreign Manuscript Copying

The Library of Congress has now concluded its 5-year program to gather and disseminate--through the Center for the Coordination of Foreign Manuscript Copying--information about photocopying of manuscript and archival material in foreign repositories. The work has been carried on with the support of the Council on Library Resources, Inc., which gave the Library a 3-year grant in 1965 and renewed it in 1968 for 2 years.

News from the Center, a semi-annual publication first issued in the spring of 1967, suspended publication with No. 7, Spring 1970.

At the close of the calendar year the Center ceased to exist as an organizational unit in LC. Its reference work will be carried on by specialists on the permanent staff of the Library's Manuscript Division. Officers of that division will continue to supervise the Library's participation in the Austrian microfilm project, a consortium of research libraries to film documents in the Austrian State Archives; the Louisiana Colonial Records Project, a similar consortium for filming documents in French repositories; and other cooperative agreements that may be developed in the future.

Presidential Papers Program

The microfilm edition of the Theodore Roosevelt Papers and its Index were released in 1970. The film is 485 reels and the Index is in three volumes, the first multi-volume index in the program. The four remaining films and indexes--for the Taft, Wilson, Garfield, and Jefferson Papers--are scheduled for publication in 1971.

Service to the Blind and Physically Handicapped

The number of blind and physically handicapped readers served directly by the Division's programs now total over 176,000. These readers are served through the National Collections in Washington (a section of the Division for the Blind and Physically Handicapped) and by 47 regional libraries throughout the United States. Another 44,000 readers are served by over 3,000 deposit collections in nursing homes, schools, and public libraries.

Funds appropriated for fiscal year 1971 will make possible the purchase of some 40,000 talking book machines and cassette players (including a new two-speed model), 600 new titles on talking books, 100 cassette tape titles, 275 press braille titles, and a continuation of the talking book and braille magazine programs. Research is continuing on flexible discs and projected books. Beginning January 1971, a series of regional workshops on cassette technology will be held for the staff of regional libraries and machine-lending agencies.

The Library has received a grant of $25,000 from the Kulas Foundation of Cleveland, Ohio, to begin programing a computer for braille music notation.

Cooperative National Film Program

The Library and the American Film Institute continued their cooperative program of acquisition and preservation of historic American motion pictures. Although direct fiscal support from the AFI was at a reduced level, the acquisitions and cataloging aspects of the AFI program continued to provide great benefits to LC. The Library's newly created motion-picture laboratory began printing operations on a daily schedule late in September and by the end of November 151,000 feet of safety-film copies had been produced from difficult-to-print, shrunken nitrate film. This auspicious start indicates that about 3 million feet of nitrate film will be preserved during the next 12-month period, with an even greater rate of preservation anticipated during the following year.

The Library increased its international film activities by sending a representative to visit foreign archives in order to stimulate the cooperative preservation of foreign films in LC's collections. A Library representative also attended the 26th Annual Congress of the International Federation of Film Archives held last summer in Lyon and its executive committee meeting held in Potsdam this past autumn.

Establishment of Congressional Research Service As LC Department

After 5 years of concentrated study and intensive preparation Congress passed the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, P.L. 91-510, approved on October 26. Two principal features of the measure provide Congress with improved Committee and floor procedures and strengthened fiscal controls over Executive department programs. A third major section centers on the expressed need of Congress for expanded sources of information and research.

To assist in the accomplishment of this goal, the act states that the Legislative Reference Service will be redesignated the Congressional Research Service (CRS) with enlarged research capabilities and broadened policy analysis responsibilities. Specifically, the CRS research and specialist staff, upon request, is to advise and assist any Committee of the House or Senate or any Joint Committee of Congress in the analysis, appraisal, and evaluation of legislative proposals within a Committee's jurisdiction. Such assistance will enable the Committee to determine more accurately than in the past the advisability of enacting legislative proposals, to estimate the probable results of legislation, and to evaluate alternative methods for achieving legislative ends.

The Reorganization Act, in addition, calls upon the Service to perform a number of other specific functions. First, CRS, at the opening of a new Congress, is to present a list of programs being carried out under existing law but which are scheduled to terminate during the life of that Congress. Second, again at the opening of a new Congress, the CRS is to provide a list of subjects and policy areas which each Committee of Congress might profitably analyze in depth. Taken together, these two lists will enable Committees to undertake extensive advance planning.

A third function requires the Service to prepare reports concerning legislative measures upon which hearings by any Committee have been announced. These reports are to contain a statement of the purpose and effect of each measure, a description of other relevant measures of similar purpose previously introduced, and indications of all action taken in previous sessions of Congress with respect to each measure. Fourth, CRS is directed, upon request or at its own initiative in anticipation of requests, to collect, classify, and analyze material and other data important in the field of public affairs and necessary to legislative activity and to make this information available in the form of reports and studies to Members and Committees of Congress upon request. Fifth, the CRS is to continue the preparation of summaries and digests of public bills and to assist Members, in general fashion, with their duties as representatives.

In order to carry out these functions, the Librarian of Congress, upon the recommendation of the Director of the Congressional Research Service, is authorized to appoint senior specialists and specialists in subject fields beyond those specifically named in the act. In addition to the regular staff of the Service, the Library is further authorized to hire individual experts or consultants on a contract basis or for temporary periods not to exceed one year. The services of educational, research, and other organizations of persons skilled in particular and specialized fields of knowledge may also be engaged.

Since most of the provisions of the Reorganization Act relating to the Legislative Reference Service are scheduled for implementation in January 1971, the members of the administrative and senior research staff of LRS have been working during the fall months on a number of projects designed to ease the transition of the "LRS into the CRS." Major emphasis in these projects has been placed on the development of methodologies to perform the new and expanded functional responsibilities assigned to the Congressional Research Service. Various systems for the exhaustive tracking of policy areas in major subject fields, which will allow the CRS staff to monitor closely public affairs and legislative activities, are being explored along with other allied topics of concern.

Federal Library Committee

In October the Institute of Library Research, University of California, Los Angeles, was awarded a $98,597 contract by the U. S. Army, Office of the Chief of Engineers, TISA Project, to pursue Phase I of a two-part research program intended to investigate library environmental design problems. The area was one identified by both the Office, Chief of Engineers, and the Federal Library Committee's Task Force on Physical Facilities as requiring immediate and intensive attention. The aim of the study is to provide Army and other librarians with the guidance and detailed information needed to design and execute better library buildings. It is anticipated that research librarians with a concern for construction should benefit from the work. The research is organized in two phases and will result in three major products: (1) an evaluative state-of-the-art report on the present knowledge of library functions, elements, and techniques of design as they relate to library physical facilities and equipment; (2) a manual for evaluating the performance of components of library facilities and equipment, and for generating specifications of requirements; and (3) a demonstration model of a "guided inquiry" system for developing library building design programs. The ultimate product of Phase I of the study will be an Evaluative Guide that will attempt to provide librarians and others with the means: (1) to justify a request for construction to the base commander and/or other administrators, based upon an explicit evaluation of the requirements for service; (2) to explore usages of existing physical facility resources; (3) to make possible a systematic exploration of a variety of possible combinations to obtain the required space; (4) to make possible a more effective means of communicating the requirements to architects and engineers; (5) to provide an authoritative base for specifying a number of performance characteristics in library furniture and equipment; and (6) to provide convincing criteria for the evaluation of the performance of the library as a complete physical entity.

Five major publications in which FLC had a part were issued during the past 6 months. A comprehensive Roster of Federal Libraries was compiled by the Biological Sciences Communication Project, George Washington University, at the request of FLC and with funds provided by the ERIC Clearinghouse for Library and Information Science. A Study of Resources and Major Subject Holdings Available in U.S. Federal Libraries Maintaining Extensive or Unique Collections of Research Materials has been issued by the Biological Sciences Communication Project, George Washington University. The sponsor of this study is FLC's Task Force on Acquisition of Library Materials and Correlation of

Federal Library Resources. The report is a guide to the research resources of 188 Federal Government libraries. A Research Design for Library Cooperative Planning and Action in the Washington, D. C. Metropolitan Area was issued with ERIC/CLIS monies. It identifies areas worthy of further examination by the Librarians' Technical Committee of the Metropolitan Council of Governments. The Executive Secretary of the FLC serves as Chairman of the Librarians' Technical Committee. The November FLC Newsletter appendix, entitled "Research in Librarianship in the U.S.A." and written by Andrew J. Eaton, Director of Libraries, Washington University, presented a historical overview of this activity. Mr. Eaton recommended the establishment of a Federal Institute of Library and Information Science.

The July-October issue (Vol. 6, Nos. 3 and 4) of the Drexel Library Quarterly was devoted to the Federal Library Committee. It is anticipated that many of the topics mentioned in this article will serve as a basis for presentations before the Second Annual "Federal Information Resources Conference" scheduled for March 30-31, 1971, at the DuPont Plaza Hotel, Washington, D. C. The conference will be held by invitation and will be cosponsored by the Association of Research Libraries, the COSATI Task Force on Libraries, the Federal Library Committee, and the U. S. Office of Education.

American Revolution Bicentennial Program

The Library's contributions to the Bicentennial celebration will be primarily of interest to scholars, but the general reader should also find the translation of John Paul Jones' Memoire, now being prepared for the press, full of the action and flavor of the exciting years between 1776 and 1786, when Jones penned his recollections for presentation to Louis XVI. The original, in English, apparently no longer exists. Jones had it translated into French and the copy given to Louis is in the Archives Nationales in Paris. Jones' personal copy of the 86-page manuscript, also in French, is in the Library's Manuscript Division. Another work recently completed by the staff and slated for publication in 1972 is English Radicals in Support of the American Revolution, 1774-1778. Containing a historical introduction and editorial notes, this reprint of leading pamphlets by English writers who were sympathetic to the American cause may stimulate revolutions of earlier thinking on where English politicians, such as Edmund Burke, really stood, and what voices were raised in protest against English policies on the eve of the Revolution.

The previously announced supplement to the Burnett edition of letters written by members of the Continental Congress may, because of the great amount of additional pertinent material being discovered, become a new comprehensive edition of all the known correspondence of delegates relating to Congressional affairs. Such a documentary publication would probably require at least a decade to compile and the publication of at least 15 volumes.

The Bicentennial Symposia Series has been assured financial support through a generous grant from the Morris and Gwendolyn Cafritz Foundation. Present plans call for five annual symposia between 1972 and 1976, with speakers of national and international reputation, addressing their remarks to the historical profession and to the Nation in general.

The Guide to manuscripts on the American Revolution in LC will be the first major contribution of the staff to the overall program. Much of the preliminary work on the domestic collections in the Manuscript Division has been completed, and a concerted effort to search out related documents in LC's extensive files of foreign reproductions has been underway since last fall. Despite the magnitude of the project, the staff expects to have the first search finished by the summer of 1971.

A survey of the literature of the American Revolution in scholarly journals has been completed by staff in the General Reference and Bibliography Division and a bibliography of that literature is scheduled for publication early in 1971. The work utilizes the major historical publications from 1895 to 1970 for an impressive compilation of articles on every phase of the Revolution. An introductory essay on the changing interpretations of the Revolution sets the material in perspective.

The Library, in cooperation with the Princeton University Press, plans the publication of a completely new volume by Julian P. Boyd on the Declaration of Independence with a history of the document and unique contemporary copies. The Library also plans to provide a sampling of its treasures in the manuscript, broadsides, prints, music and map collections by issuing a kit of facsimiles for low-cost distribution to schools, libraries, and visitors to the Library.

Other Library Publications

The Library's Publications Office is obviously intimately involved in the American Revolution Bicentennial Program, the chief products of which are publications in a variety of forms.

Another anniversary commemorated by a publication was the sesquicentennial of the Statehood of Maine. Issued in December, the catalog of the Maine exhibition, which will run through October 1971, is an 88-page, illustrated summary of the history of the State from its early exploration to the 20th century.

Other publications released since the end of fiscal 1970 range from Antarctic Bibliography, 1951-1961, to Talking Books to Profit By. Compiled by the African Section, Sub-Saharan Africa; a Guide to Serials contains 409 pages listing 4,670 entries for serials published before 1969 in western languages or in African languages using the roman alphabet. Among titles now in press are the Annual Report of the Librarian of Congress and Philosophies of American Music History by Robert Stevenson.

APPENDIX P

The Quarterly Journal of the Library of Congress for July centered on Africana in the Library and was issued in conjunction with the tenth anniversary of the African Section of the General Reference and Bibliography Division. The October issue carried reports of acquisitions of the Rare Book and Manuscript Divisions. Walter Ristow, chief of the Geography and Map Division, devoted his article to editions of the world's first regularly produced Ortelius' atlas, Theatrum Orbis Terrarum. Roy P. Basler, chief of the Manuscript Division, is the author of the lead article, "And for his Widow and Orphans," an account of the efforts of Mrs. Mary Elizabeth Booth, widow of a major in the Union Army, to procure pensions for the widows of black soldiers.

L. QUINCY MUMFORD
LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS

December 18, 1970

APPENDIX Q

REPORT OF THE NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL LIBRARY

Introduction

Much of the 1970 effort centered on implementation of the CAtaloging and INdexing (CAIN) data base, network development, and international cooperation. As a result of continued progress in the development of automation plans, three library-related publications have been turned over to commercial enterprise for issuance. Each of these major developments will be described briefly in this report.

Cataloging and Indexing Data Base (CAIN)

The CAtaloging-INdexing (CAIN) data base has been available on magnetic tape since February. The CAIN tapes contain a store of bibliographic data encompassing the broad field of agriculture and other related subject fields previously included in the *Bibliography of Agriculture* and the *National Agricultural Library Catalog*. The records previously published in the *Pesticides Documentation Bulletin*, from December 1967 through December 1969, are contained in the data base. Subject, author, biographical and organizational indexes can be compiled from the tapes in addition to comprehensive bibliographies.

The tape is standard half-inch size, 9-track, 800 bpi, in EBCDIC, with standard IBM80 character headers and trailers. It is variable length from 173 to 3,878 characters, blocked 2. It will be down-blocked to 1 on requests by a purchaser.

Data Gathering System (DGS)

The National Agricultural Library's Data Gathering System (DGS) will convert bibliographic data from source documents to magnetic tape for subsequent entry into the National Agricultural Library's CAtaloging and INdexing (CAIN) computer system.

The DGS will consist of a mini-computer with both magnetic tape and disc storage units. Sixteen keyboard input devices, each having a cathode ray tube (CRT) display unit, will serve as entry stations.

As data is introduced to the system, via the keyboard, verification will be performed and discrepancy notices displayed on the CRT screen. When properly entered, the data will be temporarily placed in the disc storage unit for later recall and review by the revisor. Following the review and any necessary revision, the information will be recorded on magnetic tape for later entry into the CAIN System.

Initial operation of the DGS is expected to commence on January 14, 1971.

APPENDIX Q

National Agricultrual Library-Related Publications

The first issue of the Bibliography of Agriculture, as published by the CCM Corporation, made its appearance in July. This monthly index to the literature of agriculture and the allied sciences is computer-produced by CCM from magnetic tapes containing bibliographic data prepared by the Library. Each issue contains author and subject indexes. Literature received more than one year after publication is generally not indexed. Unsigned articles and those signed with pseudonyms or initials, editorials, letters to the editors, and columns appearing regularly are omitted. The Bibliography is divided into four sections: a main entry section, a checklist of new government publications, a subject index, and an author index.

The publication of the Dictionary Catalog of the National Agricultural Library, 1862-1965 has been completed with volume 73. This massive publication project was begun in 1965 by Rowman and Littlefield, Inc., who photographed, edited, and prepared for publication over 1,700,000 cards. The Dictionary Catalog contains, in one alphabetic sequence, author, title and subject entries for monographs, serials, and analytics as cataloged for the main collection of the NAL, for its Bee Culture Branch, and for the former Beltsville Branch. Except for tracings, all the cataloging information was reproduced as it appears on the original cards.

The National Agricultural Library Catalog, which has been published monthly since 1966 by the same commercial firm, contains entries for all books, serials, and analytics cataloged during the previous month by the Library. With the conversion to the CAIN (CAtaloging-INdexing) system, the NAL is able to supply the publisher with computer-produced camera copy for the Catalog. Now, for the first time, there are four indexes with each issue--personal, author, corporate author, and title--and these will be cumulated semiannually and annually.

Agricultural Sciences Information Network

The Agricultural Sciences Information Network project completed its third year of investigation and discussion in September under grant arrangements with the Interuniversity Communications Council (EDUCOM). A symposium was held in February at which EDUCOM's proposals were discussed by 125 researchers and librarians from land-grant universities and the USDA. The resulting Resolution calling for systematic implementation was received by ARPAC in October and was acted upon favorably. The ASIN Committee was established and held its initial meeting in December. Implementation of some library component aspects of the network was begun by EDUCOM in conjunction with the NAL between March and September. In all these efforts, there has been close cooperation with land-grant personnel.

APPENDIX Q

International Agricultural Information System

Organization and initial technical planning steps were taken in 1970 toward an international information system. Work is centered within FAO which formally established the Advisory Panel of Experts on an International Information System for the Agricultrual Sciences. Budgetary and other organizational matters are being identified so that systematic progress may begin. FAO held an April meeting of its Study Group of Experts at which national and international systems were discussed and preparation of a composite technical document was set. That report is due in late 1970 and will serve as the major point of discussion for an international agricultural information system.

Vocabulary of Agricultural Terminology

The development of a comprehensive, unified vocabulary of agricultural terminology is based upon processing developments completed by the National Agricultural Library within recent years. In addition to further improving the Library's own performance, the unified vocabulary could constitute a major input to a proposed cooperative network of agricultural information centers--even an international network. These uses are developed in a report prepared by the Auerbach Corporation, *Cooperative Potentials in Agricultural Information Utilization*.

Users of agricultural information, both national and worldwide, could benefit greatly from such a network of information facilities, which could transfer information with speed and reasonable economy, in proper amounts and with a degree of specificity and completeness, from source to user. Benefits to the Library lie in reliable dependence upon others for the expensive processing of much foreign and highly specialized literature and better access to all the world's agricultural literature.

Joseph F. Caponio
Associate Director

December 31, 1970

APPENDIX R

REPORT OF THE NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

Medical Library Assistance Extension Act

The Medical Library Assistance Extension Act of 1970 became law on March 13, 1970. It continued authorization of funds for construction, training grants and fellowships, special scientific projects, research and development, medical library resource grants, the Regional Medical Library program, and for biomedical publications, through June 30, 1973.

Network Operations

Eleven Regional Medical Libraries are now operational. The National Library of Medicine serves as the Regional Medical Library for the Mid-Atlantic Region (District of Columbia, Maryland, North Carolina, Virginia, and West Virginia) and as the national backstop for the provision of library services in the health sciences.

MEDLARS Services

Decentralization of MEDLARS (Medical Literature Analysis and Retrieval System) search services continued during the year, with 14 centers in operation in the United States and six abroad, in Australia, England, France, Germany, Japan and Sweden. Agreements have been reached to establish MEDLARS centers in Canada and Australia, but they are not yet operational. Over 100 MEDLARS Orientation Programs were provided to more than 3,000 attendees during the year. About 24,000 demand searches were performed throughout the network.

Publications

In its first year over 3,000 copies of *Abridged Index Medicus*, an index to articles in approximately 100 English-language, clinically oriented journals, were sold on subscription. This publication is intended for use in smaller medical libraries or by physicians. The Library will make available the *Cumulative Abridged Index Medicus*, now scheduled for publication in January 1971. The decision to produce annual cumulations is in response to requests from users of *AIM*.

NLM is also developing plans for a health sciences clearinghouse for the collection and dissemination of bibliographies. An important output will be production of the *Bibliography of Medical Bibliographies* which has already been produced in a pilot issue. Plans are now being discussed regarding publication of the *Bibliography* on a quarterly and cumulated basis.

The clearinghouse made available over 50 new printed literature searches during the year, and distributed more than 30,000 bibliographies during 1970 on request.

Distribution of a semi-weekly proof sheet, which supplies cataloging data to the medical library community and represents the current production input for NLM's *Current Catalog*, was undertaken by the Medical Library Association on July 1, as part of a collaborative project.

Serials Projects

NLM has continued to supply serial holdings to the data base of the *Union Catalog of Medical Periodicals* produced by the Medical Library Center of New York. Eighteen thousand of NLM's titles will have been input by March 1971. Forty-four hundred titles with holdings, including all *Index Medicus* titles, have been supplied to the National Serials Data Project to aid in producing a checking edition.

Card Service

At the end of calendar year 1970, proposals were requested for commercial production and distribution of National Library of Medicine catalog cards. The cards will supply full descriptive and subject cataloging and NLM classification.

MEDLARS II

The MEDLARS II system, which is planned as an integrated total library system, is being developed in two phases, referred to as the INITIAL and EXTENDED systems. INITIAL processing is characterized by batch computer operation and can be described as having the same capabilities as MEDLARS I but with the addition of an augmented MESH (Medical Subject Headings) vocabulary, new equipment and selected supporting products. The EXTENDED system will provide for on-line access to the computer and automated support for additional library functions.

The project directed toward the development of the MEDLARS II system for the Library continued through the past year. A detailed functional design was completed for the initial phase of the system. Major pieces of the computer softwear required for the system were completed and tested. Major schedule delays have required adjustment of operational target dates.

Suit Alleging Copyright Infringement Against U.S. Government

The complaint filed in the U.S. Court of Claims by the Williams & Wilkins Company of Baltimore on February 27, 1968, alleged infringement of copyright on the part of the United States Government, naming specifically the library of the National Institutes of Health and the National Library of Medicine, and claimed damages. The alleged infringement was based on the photocopying of certain articles from journals on which Williams & Wilkins claimed copyright.

A hearing before the Honorable James F. Davis, Commissioner, was called for Wednesday, September 9, 1970. The proceedings continued through six days.

Witnesses testifying at the hearing included representatives from the National Institutes of Health, National Library of Medicine, Williams & Wilkins Company, the Federation of American Societies for Experimental Biology, and health sciences professionals in their capacities as authors and requesters of published material.

Submission of additional briefs from counsel for the plaintiff and defendant will be followed by a preliminary decision by the Commissioner. Such decisions are usually reviewed by the full Court after oral arguments by both sides.

Lister Hill National Center for Biomedical Communications

Congress has appropriated funds for planning the new Lister Hill National Center for Biomedical Communications to be constructed on the National Institutes of Health campus adjoining the NLM.

In June, a new experimental service called AIM-TWX was initiated, to provide rapid, responsive searching of selected English-language medical literature. Bibliographic information on articles indexed in the NLM's new *Abridged Index Medicus* during the last five years has been stored in a time-sharing computer in Santa Monica, California. Access to the system is via a TWX terminal or teletype terminal connected to the telephone network. At present, over 30 institutions are using the system experimentally for obtaining machine searches of the literature. The experiment is being conducted to identify the need for and usefulness of such services to help medical practitioners in isolated areas, to assist in undergraduate, graduate and continuing medical education, and to provide information as needed for health care.

Three other programs of research and development were undertaken by the Lister Hill National Center during 1970. An experiment in on-line indexing using the LISTAR system (Lincoln Information Storage and Associative Retrieval) at the Lincoln Laboratory, a center for research operated by Massachusetts Institute of Technology, began in August, with measurements taken on the three phases of indexing, bibliographic input, subject indexing, and revision. Since April, the NLM has been experimenting with satellite communication for the transfer of medical information between the National

Institutes of Health and contact points in Alaska, California, Washington and Wisconsin. The NLM is now also engaged in the design and development of an experimental interactive television network in New England.

Specialized Information Services

Specialized Information Services (SIS) was restructured during the year and among the projects undertaken were the collection of toxicology data related to 700 chemicals for incorporation into a computer-based Toxicological Information System; inclusion of the Chemical Abstracts Service Substructure Search System and related name matching systems into the NLM and/or NIH systems; preparation of the Bibliography of Drug Interactions and Selected Excerpts (1967-1970); preparation of a roster of 3200 individual authorities in toxicology in an on-line computer accessible data base; and the development, in cooperation with the Food and Drug Administration, of a computer system to support the collection and analysis of epidemiological data on the effect of pesticides in humans conducted by the Community Studies of Pesticides Program.

Extramural Programs

The Medical Library Assistance Extension Act of 1970 authorized the conduct of the Regional Program by both grants and contracts, and the Library has begun negotiating contracts for the service portions of the Regional Medical Library program. The amendments dealing with the Resources program remove the previous rigid formula with regard to the amount of grant awards and allows flexibility in administration. Taking advantage of this flexibility, the National Library of Medicine has developed a program which provides both basic improvement grants for smaller institutions, as well as a system of project grants to aid larger libraries in improving services to users.

During the past fiscal year, 38 new grants were awarded, bringing the total number of active grants to 498. Of particular significance were seven new grants under the Training program. Some 100 health information specialists are currently receiving support under various NLM Training programs

The Library also administers a special foreign currency program (P.L. 480) for improvement of the international exchange of published biomedical information. During the year, projects were developed in Isreal, Poland, Yugoslavia, and India. Current projects include critical reviews, histories of medicine, translations of current biomedical information, indexing, and abstracting.

Martin Cummings, M.D.

December 29, 1970

APPENDIX S

SEIDMAN & SEIDMAN *Certified Public Accountants*

OFFICES THROUGHOUT THE UNITED STATES

OTHER PARTS OF WORLD
BINDER SEIDMAN-THORNE INTERNATIONAL GROUP

1200 EIGHTEENTH STREET, N.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036
202/293-1570

January 27, 1971

Board of Directors
Association of Research Libraries
Washington, D. C.

Gentlemen:

We have examined the balance sheet (cash basis) of Association of Research Libraries as of December 31, 1970, and the related statements of cash receipts and disbursements of the general operating fund and special program funds for the year then ended. Our examination was made in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards, and accordingly included such tests of the accounting records and such other auditing procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances.

The financial statements of the Foreign Newspaper Microfilm Project were examined by other public accountants whose reports have been furnished to us. Our opinion, insofar as it relates to the amounts included for this project, is based solely upon such reports.

These statements have been prepared on the cash receipts and disbursements basis, and, as a result, omit material assets and liabilities. Accordingly, they do not, in our opinion, present financial position and results of operations as they would appear had generally accepted accrual basis accounting principles been applied in their preparation.

In our opinion, the accompanying balance sheet at December 31, 1970, and the related statements of cash receipts and disbursements for the year then ended present fairly the assets and liabilities arising from cash transactions and the revenues collected and disbursements made on a basis consistent with that of the preceding year.

Seidman & Seidman

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

BALANCE SHEET (CASH BASIS)
DECEMBER 31, 1970

ASSETS

Cash in bank and on hand	$ 4 255
Cash in savings account	128 064
Cash held by others - agency fund	106 137
Certificates of deposit	150 000
Travel advances to employees	2 445
Deposits	229
Total	$391 130

LIABILITIES

Payroll taxes withheld	$ 2 311
Special program funds for which the Association is accountable to the grantors	184 532
Total liabilities	186 843

FUND BALANCES

Foreign Newspaper Microfilm Project agency fund	$106 137
General operating fund	98 150
Total fund balances	204 287
Total	$391 130

APPENDIX S

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

GENERAL OPERATING FUND
STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS
YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1970

RECEIPTS:	
Dues	$126 000
Publications	3 244
Royalties	432
Interest	14 599
Miscellaneous	500
TOTAL	144 775
DISBURSEMENTS:	
Auditing and legal	27 079
Board and committee expenses	12 654
Dues	975
Equipment purchases and rental	2 632
Executive secretary and staff travel	2 435
Hospitalization	901
Insurance and bonding	2 608
Miscellaneous	1 847
Payroll taxes	2 682
Periodicals and subscriptions	1 259
Printing and mailing	12 612
Postage and freight	1 889
Rent	10 783
Retirement plan	12 211
Salaries	96 265
Stationery and supplies	7 721
Telephone	2 806
TOTAL	199 359
Less: Administrative expenses charged to special program funds	50 006
	149 353
EXCESS OF DISBURSEMENTS OVER RECEIPTS	(4 578)
Transfer from special program funds	3 125
GENERAL OPERATING FUND BALANCE - BEGINNING	99 603
GENERAL OPERATING FUND BALANCE - ENDING	$ 98 150

APPENDIX S

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIABRARIES

FOREIGN NEWSPAPER MICROFILM PROJECT AGENCY FUND
STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS
YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1970

RECEIPTS:	
Dues	$ 55 544
Sales to members and non-members	83 110
Interest	525
TOTAL	139 179
DISBURSEMENTS:	
Audit	400
Miscellaneous	495
Newspapers and microfilm	41 908
Purchases for members and non-members	59 413
Salaries	16 353
Storage	280
Supplies	1 339
TOTAL	120 188
EXCESS OF RECEIPTS OVER DISBURSEMENTS	18 991
FUND BALANCE - BEGINNING	87 146
FUND BALANCE - ENDING	$106 137

APPENDIX S

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

SPECIAL PROGRAM FUNDS
STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS
YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1970

	Center for Chinese Research Materials	Book Storage Project
RECEIPTS:		
Grants	$124 573	$ -
Sale of publications	73 508	
Other		
TOTALS	198 081	-
DISBURSEMENTS:		
Administrative expenses	10 000	
Consulting fees		
Cost of publications	69 010	
Employee benefits	7 261	
Equipment rental		
Miscellaneous		
Office expense	1 596	
Payroll	52 316	
Payroll taxes	1 791	
Periodicals	758	
Postage	234	
Printing	3 034	1 440
Purchase of equipment	431	
Rent	6 222	
Telephone	336	
Travel	5 690	
Return of unused funds		13 231
TOTALS	158 679	14 671
EXCESS OF RECEIPTS OVER DISBURSEMENTS	39 402	(14 671)
Transfers to A.R.L. general operating fund	(3 125)	
FUND BALANCE - BEGINNING	66 935	14 671
FUND BALANCE - ENDING	$103 212	$ -

APPENDIX S

tudy of ighting irements Libraries	University Library Management Study	Microform Technology Project #1	Microform Technology Project #2	Slavic Bibliographic and Documentation Center	National Serials Pilot Project	Inter-Library Loans	Preservation Library Material	University Library Management Study - Office	Total
$ -	$5 000	$25 140	$13 649	$79 075	$75 000	$ -	$5 234	$15 000	$342 671
				855					74 363
					464				464
-	5 000	25 140	13 649	79 930	75 464	-	5 234	15 000	417 498
		8 281	1 081	10 000	18 431	52	911	1 250	50 006
250		4 900	868				666		6 684
				3 222					72 232
				5 803	6 970		365	881	21 280
90					5 586			85	5 761
210		726	105	271	3 599			500	5 411
			248	1 280	1 124	3		19	4 270
		10 000	5 000	41 504	52 235		3 060	5 250	169 365
				1 377	1 759			252	5 179
				234	143				1 135
			207	620					1 061
	2 103	953	300			90		47	7 967
				1 118					1 549
				4 458					10 680
		99		592	1 386				2 413
		3 044	1 565	2 530	2 124	1 672	164	913	17 702
295									13 526
845	2 103	28 003	9 374	73 009	93 357	1 817	5 166	9 197	396 221
(845)	2 897	(2 863)	4 275	6 921	(17 893)	(1 817)	68	5 803	21 277
						-	-	-	(3 125)
845	(2 897)	3 441	(4 275)	75 153	12 507	-	-	-	166 380
-	$ -	$ 578	$ -	$82 074	$(5 386)	$(1 817)	$ 68	$ 5 803	$184 532

APPENDIX S

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

PROOF OF CASH
YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1970

CASH BALANCE - BEGINNING	$356 825
ADD: Excess of receipts over disbursements	
ARL general operating fund	(4 578)
Foreign Newspaper Microfilm Project Agency fund	18 991
Special program funds for which the Association is accountable to the grantors	21 277
ADD: Payroll taxes fourth quarter 1970 paid January, 1971	2 311
LESS: Payroll taxes fourth quarter 1969 paid January, 1970	(3 696)
CASH BALANCE - ENDING	$391 130

APPENDIX T

MEMBERSHIP OF ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

January, 1971

University of Alabama Library
Tuscaloosa, Alabama 35486
Joseph A. Jackson, Acting Librarian

University of Alberta Library
Edmonton, Alberta, Canada
Bruce Peel, Director

University of Arizona Library
Tucson, Arizona 85721
Robert K. Johnson, Librarian

Boston Public Library
Boston, Massachusetts 02117
Philip J. McNiff, Librarian

Boston University Library
Boston, Massachusetts 02215
John Laucus, Director

University of British Columbia Library
Vancouver 8, British Columbia, Canada
Basil Stuart-Stubbs, Librarian

Brown University Library
Providence, Rhode Island 02912
David A. Jonah, Librarian

University of California Library
Berkeley, California 94720
James E. Skipper, Librarian

University of California Library
Davis, California 95616
J.R. Blanchard, Librarian

University of California Library
Los Angeles, California 90024
Robert Vosper, Librarian

Case Western Reserve University Libraries
Cleveland, Ohio 44106
James V. Jones, Director

Center for Research Libraries
Chicago, Illinois 60637
Gordon R. Williams, Director

University of Chicago Library
Chicago, Illinois 60637
Herman H. Fussler, Director

University of Cincinnati Libraries
Cincinnati, Ohio 45221
Bruce Kauffman, Director

University of Colorado Library
Boulder, Colorado 80304
Ralph E. Ellsworth, Director

Columbia University Libraries
New York, N. Y. 10027
Warren J. Haas, Director

University of Connecticut Library
Storrs, Connecticut 06268
John P. McDonald, Director

Cornell University Libraries
Ithaca, New York 14850
David Kaser, Director

Dartmouth College Libraries
Hanover, New Hampshire 03755
Edward C. Lathem, Librarian

Duke University Libraries
Durham, North Carolina 27706
Benjamin E. Powell, Librarian

University of Florida Libraries
Gainesville, Florida 32603
Gustave A. Harrer, Director

Florida State University Library
Tallahassee, Florida 32306
N. Orwin Rush, Librarian

APPENDIX T

Georgetown University Library
Washington, D. C. 20007
Joseph E. Jeffs, Director

University of Georgia Libraries
Athens, Georgia 30601
W. P. Kellam, Director

Harvard University Library
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138
Douglas W. Bryant, Librarian

University of Illinois Library
Urbana, Illinois 61803
Robert B. Downs, Dean of Library Administration

Indiana University Libraries
Bloomington, Indiana 47405
Robert A. Miller, Director

University of Iowa Libraries
Iowa City, Iowa 52240
Leslie W. Dunlap, Director

Iowa State University Library
Ames, Iowa 50010
Warren Kuhn, Director

John Crerar Library
Chicago, Illinois 60616
William S. Budington, Director

Johns Hopkins University Library
Baltimore, Maryland 21218
John H. Berthel, Librarian

Joint University Libraries
Nashville, Tennessee 37203
Frank P. Grisham, Director

University of Kansas Library
Lawrence, Kansas 66044
David W. Heron, Director

University of Kentucky Libraries
Lexington, Kentucky 40506
Stuart Forth, Director

Library of Congress
Washington, D. C. 20540
L. Quincy Mumford, Librarian

Linda Hall Library
Kansas City, Missouri 64110
Joseph C. Shipman, Librarian

Louisiana State University Library
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70803
T. N. McMullan, Director

McGill University Library
Montreal 2, Quebec, Canada
Keith Crouch, Director

University of Maryland Library
College Park, Maryland 20742
Howard Rovelstad, Librarian

University of Massachusetts Libraries
Amherst, Massachusetts 01003
David Clay, Director

Massachusetts Institute of Technology Libraries
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139
William N. Locke, Director

University of Michigan Library
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104
Frederick H. Wagman, Director

Michigan State University Library
East Lansing, Michigan 48823
Richard Chapin, Librarian

University of Minnesota Libraries
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Edward B. Stanford, Director

University of Missouri Library
Columbia, Missouri 65202
C. Edward Carroll, Director

National Agricultural Library
Beltsville, Maryland 20705
John Sherrod, Director

National Library of Medicine
Bethesda, Maryland 20203
Martin M. Cummings, Director

University of Nebraska Libraries
Lincoln, Nebraska 68508
Frank A. Lundy, Director

New York Public Library
New York, N. Y. 10018
Edward G. Freehafer, Director

New York State Library
State Education Department
Albany, New York 12224
John A. Humphry, Assistant
Commissioner for Libraries

New York University Libraries
New York, N. Y. 10003
Charles F. Gosnell, Director

University of North Carolina Libraries
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27515
Jerrold Orne, Director

Northwestern University Libraries
Evanston, Illinois 60210
Thomas R. Buckman, Librarian

University of Notre Dame Libraries
South Bend, Indiana 46556
Rev. James W. Simonson, Director

Ohio State University Libraries
Columbus, Ohio 43210
Lewis C. Branscomb, Director

University of Oklahoma Library
Norman, Oklahoma 73069
Arthur M. McAnally, Librarian

Oklahoma State University Library
Stillwater, Oklahoma 74075
Roscoe Rouse, Librarian

University of Oregon Library
Eugene, Oregon 97403
Carl W. Hintz, Librarian

University of Pennsylvania Libraries
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104
Richard DeGennaro, Director

Pennsylvania State University Library
University Park, Pennsylvania 16802
W. Carl Jackson, Director

University of Pittsburgh Library
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213
Glenora Edwards Rossell, Director

Princeton University Library
Princeton, New Jersey 08540
William S. Dix, Librarian

Purdue University Library
Lafayette, Indiana 47907
Oliver C. Dunn, Associate Director

University of Rochester Libraries
Rochester, New York 14627
Ben Bowman, Director

Rutgers University Library
New Brunswick, New Jersey 08901
Roy L. Kidman, Director

St. Louis University Library
St. Louis, Missouri 63108
Eugene P. Kennedy, Director

University of Southern California Library
Los Angeles, California 90007
Hazel Rea, Acting Librarian

Southern Illinois University Library
Carbondale, Illinois 62901
Ralph E. McCoy, Director

APPENDIX T

Stanford University Libraries
Stanford, California 94305
David C. Weber, Director

State University of New York at Buffalo Libraries
Buffalo, New York 14214
Myles Slatin, Director

Syracuse University Library
Syracuse, New York 13210
Warren N. Boes, Director

Temple University Library
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19122
Arthur Hamlin, Director

University of Tennessee Libraries
Knoxville, Tennessee 37916
Richard Boss, Director

University of Texas Libraries
Austin, Texas 78712
Fred Folmer, Librarian

Texas A&M University Library
College Station, Texas 77843
John B. Smith, Director

University of Toronto Libraries
Toronto 5, Ontario, Canada
Robert H. Blackburn, Chief Librarian

Tulane University Library
New Orleans, Louisiana 70118
John H. Gribbin, Director

University of Utah Library
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112
Ralph D. Thomson, Librarian

University of Virginia Libraries
Charlottesville, Virginia 22903
Ray Frantz, Librarian

University of Washington Library
Seattle, Washington 98105
Marion A. Milczewski, Director

Washington State University Library
Pullman, Washington 99163
G. Donald Smith, Director

Washington University Libraries
St. Louis, Missouri 63130
Andrew J. Eaton, Director

Wayne State University Library
Detroit, Michigan 48202
Mark M. Gormley, Director

University of Wisconsin Libraries
Madison, Wisconsin 53706
Louis Kaplan, Director

Yale University Libraries
New Haven, Connecticut 06520
Rutherford D. Rogers, Librarian